НАУКОВЕ
ТОВАРИСТВО
ІМ. ШЕВЧЕНКА

Василь Ящун

ВИБРАНЕ ІЗ СЛАВІСТИКИ

MEMOIRS OF THE SHEVCHENKO SCIENTIFIC SOCIETY
MEMOIRES DE LA SOCIÉTÉ SCIENTIFIQUE ŠEVČENKO
MITTEILUNGEN DER SCHEWTSCHENKO GESELLSCHAFT
DER WISSENSCHAFTEN

vol. 216
Philological Section

WASYL JASZCZUN

SELECTED PAPERS ON SLAVIC STUDIES

NEW YORK — PARIS — SYDNEY — TORONTO
1991

ЗАПИСКИ НАУКОВОГО ТОВАРИСТВА ІМ. ШЕВЧЕНКА

том 216
Філологічна Секція

ВАСИЛЬ ЯЩУН

ВИБРАНЕ ІЗ СЛАВІСТИКИ

НЮ ЙОРК — ПАРИЖ — СИДНЕЙ — ТОРОНТО
1991

Library of Congress Catalog Card Number: 90-64422

ISBN: 0-88054-168-7

Printed in the USA by Computoprint Corporation
35 Harding Avenue, Clifton, NJ 07011
1(201)772-2166 Fax: 1(201)772-1963

Передмова

Перед читачем-науковцем новий, 216 том *Записок НТШ,* що містить вибрані філологічні праці й статті д-ра Василя Ящуна, емеритованого професора славістики в Пітсбурзькому університеті.

Василь Ящун, народжений 24 січня 1915 р. в с. Шнирів, Брідського повіту, в Західній Україні, вийшов у світ як абсольвент Греко-Католицької Богословської Академії у Львові в 1938 р. Коли воєнні обставини примусили його еміґрувати з рідного краю на захід, він продовжував студії славістики в університеті ім. Карла Франца в Ґрацу, в Австрії, і завершив їх докторатом філософії в 1948 р. Прибувши до ЗСА в 1949 р., почав свою науково-педагогічну працю в Пенсільванському університеті у Філядельфії, продовжував її в Стейтовому університеті в Айові, а далі — в Пітсбурзькому університеті, де пройшов ступені від доцента до звичайного професора і на цій позиції працював до виходу на пенсію в 1981 р.

Студії в Богословській Академії та в університеті спрямували д-ра Ящуна до досліджень у ділянці мовознавства, передовсім слов'янського, і літературознавства. Працюючи дослідницько в цих ділянках, він уключився в українські й американські наукові товариства й об'єднання, брав участь у наукових з'їздах і нарадах. У Пітсбурзькому університеті був не тільки викладачем численних курсів, нижчих і вищих, але й виконував кілька років обов'язки керівника Слов'янського відділу, увів маґістерську й докторську програми, згодом теж курси української мови, був дорадником студентів у програмах їх студій, був активним співпрацівником в університетських відділах, членом комітетів для маґістерських і докторських дисертацій, керував маґістерськими й докторськими

працями зі слов'янського мовознавства. Він є головним автором двох університетських мовознавчих підручників (див. список його інших вибраних публікацій в кінці книги).

Крім цих двох книжок у дорібку наукових публікацій д-ра. В. Ящуна є шість монографічних праць і численні науково-дослідні статті, багато з яких друковано в наукових збірниках НТШ, УВАН у Канаді, УВАН в ЗСА, УВУ і УКУ. В українських журналах і пресі надруковано чимало його науково-популярних статтей, есеїв і рецензій, а також багато рецензій ув американському *Slavic and East European Journal* (див. в кінці книги). Був співробітником літературно-наукового квартальника *Дзвони,* що виходив у Римі. Виголошував наукові доповіді на конференціях українських та американських установ. З них більшість на мовознавчі, менше на літературні теми. Володіє крім української мови також польською, російською, англійською, німецькою, знає добре латину, мови білоруську і староцерковнослов'янську та читає тексти словацькі, чеські і сербо-хорвацькі.

Проф. Ящун був членом Сенату Пітсбурзького університету від 1961 р. до 1981 р. Він професійний член НТШ (дійсний член у Філологічний Секції), чл. Українсько-Американської Асоціяції університетських професорів, чл. Українського Історичного Товариства, б. чл. Американської Асоціяції викладачів слов'янських і східньоевропейських мов, б. чл. Американського Товариства Народних культур, почесний член Американського Товариства Чужих мов, б. чл. Американського Товариства Назвознавців. Про нього є довідки в: *International Who's Who in Education, Directory of American Scholars, Who's Who in the East, Ukrainians in America* і в *Огляді праці Осередку НТШ у Філядельфії.*

Вже з молодих літ жевріла в Ящунові поетична іскра. Він писав вірші, та їх не публікував. Щойно згодом зрефлектувався, що варто видрукувати бодай дещо з поетичних поривів, надхненних Музою Полігимнією, і видав дотепер три збірки поезій: *Дійсне і мрійне* (1981), *З нив і доріг життя* (1986), і *До світла* (1988). Ці поезії, написані в неоромантичному й неоклясичному стилі, віддзеркалюють універсалістичний світогляд поета з корінням у націо-

нальному й релігійному ґрунті. Рецензії літературних критиків на ці збірки переважно дуже прихильні. Ящун переклав також чимало із класиків: великобританських (Віліям Вордсворт), американських (Генрі В. Лонґфеллов, Ралф В. Емерсон, Сідні Ланір, Вейчел Лінзі, Роберт Фрост), німецьких (Йоган Ріск, Йоган Вольфґанґ фон Ґете, Юстінус Кернер, Гайнріх Гайне, Йозеф Айхендорф), польських (Адам Міцкевіч, Юліюш Словацький, Ципріян Норвід, Марія Конопніцька, Юліюш Тувім, Чеслав Мілош), російських (Міхаіл Лермонтов, Іван Бунін, Іван Єлаґін), і білоруських (Якуб Колас, Янка Купала). Його вірші поміщено в *The World of Poetry Anthology*. На Шостій Всеамериканській конвенції *World of Poetry* 25-28 серпня в Лас Анджелес отримав нагороду "Golden Poet of 1990". Він теж член Об'єднання Українських Письменників "Слово".

Бажаючи зберегти в формі книжки головнішу продукцію своїх науково-дослідних робіт, проф. Ящун вибрав важливіші публікації, вже раніше друковані в наукових збірниках, науково-популярних журналах і часописах, і НТШ видало їх у цьому томі *Записок Наукового Товариства ім. Шевченка.* Серед цих праць — 11 мовознавчих, 4 літературні і 5 фолкльорних.

Мовознавець знаходить у цих працях з'ясування кореляції звучні сучасної української мови зі звучнею давньої української мови і мови праслов'янської і бачить самобутній розвиток української мови, незалежний від розвитку двох інших східньослов'янських мов. Дослідника найбільше цікавлять проблеми фонології, морфології, етимології слів, словотворення, семасіології і українських лексичних запозичень із чужих мов. В опрацюванні тем застосовує здебільшого принципи сучасної методології, вживаної в аплікативній і структуральній лінґвістиці на Заході.

З ділянки літературознавства читаємо три праці про Тараса Шевченка, його релігійні й морально-етичні погляди всупереч дошукуванням у поета атеїзму в публікаціях радянських літературознавців; про державнотворчі ідеї поета та його постуляти в будові і розбудові нації; про Шевченка в світлі філософії індивідуалізму й персоналізму. У цій же ділянці є праця про Івана Франка, його погляди на естетичні принципи в літературній праці.

В дослідженнях фолкльору наш учений розробляє питання леґендарних мотивів про св. о. Миколая чудотворця, їх походження і розповсюднення в Україні. Тут теж опрацьована тема розвитку билін, їх героїчного змісту та їх долі в совєтський період.

Всі наукові праці та науково-популярні статті професора Василя Ящуна визначаються ориґінальністю, сумлінним дослідженням проблем, докладним і кропітким опрацюванням їх і переконливими висновками. Читач привітає цей збірник праць шановного автора, що саме, коли в січні цього року минуло йому 75 років життя, дав нам вибраний дорібок своїх трудолюбивих днів для добра української науки й українського Народу. В його національно-патріотичних віршах знайде пророчі слова Тараса Шевченка про визволення України з неволі, а в церковно-релігійній поезії — віщі слова митрополита Андрея Шептицького про відродження нашої знедоленої Церкви.

Проф. д-р Василь Лев
1990

Foreword

Dr. Wasyl Jaszczun, Professor Emeritus of Slavic Studies in the University of Pittsburgh, was born on January 24, 1915, in Western Ukraine. He graduated from the Polish gymnasium in Brody in 1933, and the Greek-Catholic Theological Academy in Lviv in 1938. He continued his studies of Slavic languages and literatures at the Karl-Franz University in Graz, Austria, where he received his Ph.D. in Slavic Philology in 1948. The following year he came to the U.S.A. and began pursuing his teaching and scholarly career at the University of Pennsylvania, the State University of Iowa and finally in the Department of Slavic Languages and Literatures at the University of Pittsburgh, where he was promoted from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor and in 1965 to Full Professor. Here he taught for twenty years numerous undergraduate and graduate courses, until he retired in 1981.

In Pittsburgh, besides his teaching responsibilities, Prof. Jaszczun was the acting chairman of the Department for a few years, expanded M.A. and Ph.D. courses in Slavic linguistics, was a major advisor to undergraduate students for eighteen years, directed graduate students' work in Russian and Slavic linguistics, was an active member of various committees while remaining an active participant in the community life. Of particular note, he was the main author of two language manuals for undergraduate students (see *Wasyl Jaszczun's other selected publications* at the end of this book).

Besides the above manuals, Jaszczun's scholarly publications include six linguistic monographs and numerous research papers published in the scholarly volumes by The Shevchenko Scientific Society, The Academy of Arts and Sciences in the U.S.A., The Ukrainian Free Academy of Sciences in Canada, The Ukrainian Free University in West Germany, and The Ukrainian Catholic University in Rome. Many research articles, essays and book reviews were published in the Ukrain-

ian journals and press, and many book reviews in *The Slavic and East European Journal.* He was a contributor to the literary and scholarly journal *Dzvony* (The Bells) in Rome, read many research papers at the American and Ukrainian scholarly conventions. He has a great command of Ukrainian, Russian and Polish, a good command of English and German, has a good knowledge of Belorussian, Latin, and Old Church Slavonic, and a reading knowledge of Czech, Slovak and Serbo-Croation. He is listed in: *International Who's Who in Education, Directory of American Scholars, Who's Who in the East, Ukrainians in America,* and *Ohljad praci Oseredku NTSh in Philadelphia.*

Professor Jaszczun is also a poet. So far his three books of Ukrainian poems have been published: *Dijsne i mrijne* (The Real and the Dreams), *Z nyv i dorih zyttja* (From the Fields and Paths of Life) and *Do Svitla* (To the Light). Most reviews of these books by literary critics have been very favorable. Besides writing Ukrainian poems, he also translated many poems of non-Ukrainian classics: Great Britain (William Wordsworth), American (Henry W. Longfellow, Ralph W. Emerson, Sidney Lanier, Vachel Lindsay, Robert Frost), German (Johann Risk, Johann Wolfgang von Goethe, Justinus Kerner, Heinrich Heine, Joseph Eichendorf), Polish (Adam Mickiewicz, Juliusz Słowacki, Cyprian Norwid, Maria Konopnicka, Juliusz Tuwim, Czesław Miłosz), Russian (Michail Lermontov, Ivan Bunin, Ivan Yelagin), and Belorussian (Jakub Kolas, Janka Kupala). His poems have been included in *The World of Poetry Anthology.* At the Sixth Annual Party held in Las Vegas, August 25-28th he has been awarded a trophy "Golden Poet of 1990" from the *World of Poetry* for his poetic achievements. He is a member of The Ukrainian Writers' Association "Slovo".

Wishing to have some of his better papers published in a book, he selected twenty of them for this volume; eleven in linguistics, four in literature and five in folklore (see *Contents* and *Synopsis*). Sixteen of them are written in English, two in German and two in Ukrainian.

All the papers in this volume reflect originality, conscientious and painstaking research, accurate elaboration, and convincing evidence and conclusions. The reader will welcome this volume published on the 75th birthday of Professor Wasyl Jaszczun.

Professor Wasyl Lew, Ph.D.
1990

Contents

Literature

Folklore

The Main Phonological Reflexes of Common Slavic in Ukrainian in Tabular Form

According to the views of scholars, the Common Slavic (Proto-Slavic) epoch began after the disintegration of Indo-European linguistic unity, that is, approximately by the end of the third and the beginning of the second millenium B.C., lasting untill about the end of the sixth century A.D. In this 2,500-year period the Common Slavic language (which diverged from Indo-European as one of its branches) very likely was spoken by all the Slavic tribes settled on the vast territories from the middle Dnipro and Desna rivers on the east, to the left bank of Oder river on the west, to the Baltic sea coast on the north-west and upper Dnister river and the foot-hills of the Carpathian mountains on the south. Common Slavic, naturally, did not live stagnantly but underwent changes. However, its detailed periodization cannot be given because there are no monuments written in it. Usually two periods of Common Slavic are suggested: an early period, until about the beginning of the fifth century, and a late period, lasting until the end of the sixth century. In the initial period it retained many elements, especially in phonology, common to other Indo-European languages. Therefore, when investigating elements of Common Slavic of that period, scholars compare data of various Indo-European languages. In the second period, preceding the formation of the separate Slavic languistic groups, the Slavic tribal languages already possessed those characteristic features which distinguished them from other Indo-European languages. Toward the end of the sixth century Common Slavic diverged into three

Slavic groups, eastern, western and southern. The tables of this work show the main phonological reflexes of Common Slavic in one of the east Slavic languages, Ukrainian, in its earliest period and in its modern existence.

The tables include reflexes of the following elements: vowels, diphthongs, diphthongal combinations, consonants, final consonants combined with preceding vowels, changes in consonant clusters, non-velars combined with *j*, the combinations *tort, tolt, tert, telt,* the combinations of *ĭr, ĭl, ŭr, ŭl, ĭm, ŭm, ĭn, ŭn,* and the reflexes of the three palatalizations of velars.

Symbols used in these tables are those customary in linguistic writings: ~ alternates with, > evolves into, < evolves from, V vowel, C consonant. Exceptional are reconstructed forms of Common Slavic. They are not marked with an asterisk because it is obvious that they are such. The Old Ukrainian and modern Ukrainian examples are cited in Cyrillic, their phonemic transcription being enclosed in slant lines / /. Phonetic transcription is enclosed in square brackets [ ].

Abbreviations used in these tables are: n = nominative, g = genitive, d = dative, acc = accusative, v = vocative, l = locative, sg = singular, pl = plural, Bbl = bibliography. An apostrophe marks the phonemic softness of a consonant, except that apostrophe after Cyrillic labials *п, в, б, м, ф* before iotacized vowels *я, ю, є, ї* in modern Ukrainian mark hardness of these labials. CSl = Common Slavic, OUkr = Old Ukrainian (= Kyjivan, Kievan Rus' language), MUkr = Modern Ukrainian.

Reflexes of vowels

CSl							
early period		late period		OUkr (XI-XII c.)	MUkr (XX c.)	Meaning
ā	mātī	a	mati	а мати /máty/	а мати /máty/	mother
ŏ	ŏsĭ	o	osь	о ось /os'/	о вісь, осі /vis', os'i/	axis
			nosъ	носъ /nos/	ніс /nis/	nose
ē	vēra	ě	věra	Ѣ[1] вѣра /víra/	і віра /víra/	faith
ĕ	dĕsentĭ	e	desętь	е десять /dés'at'/	е десять /dés'at'/	ten
	neslŭ		neslъ	е неслъ /nésl/	ніс /n'is/	he carried
ī	gīu̯ŏs	i	ž'ivъ	и живъ /ž'iv/	и жив(ий) /žyv(ýj)/	alive
ĭ	vĭdou̯a	ь	vьdova	ь[2] вьдова /vdová/	ø вдова /vdová/	widow
ū	tū	y	ty	ы(и)[3] ты /ty/	и ти /ty/	you
ŭ	sūnŭs	ъ	synъ	ъ[3] сынъ /syn/	ø син /syn/	son

[1] It is difficult to determine the exact sound value represented by the letter ѣ in the earliest period of the old Ukrainian language. In the literary monuments of Kyjivan (Kievan) Rus' of the XI-XII centuries there are cases of a mixture of ѣ with *и* [i] which, as V. Jagič noted, indicates popular pronunciation of Ѣ as [i] (Bbl. 50, 4th article); O. Lehr-Spławiński called this pronunciation the oldest characteristic feature of the vernacular of the people living on the right bank of the Dnipro river and on the south-western territory of Rus' (Bbl. 54, p. 22). The mixture of ѣ with *e* occurs only in Church Slavic texts in Kyjivan Rus' and reflects a Church pronunciation of Ѣ at that time, that is, as an open wide [ē]. A similar opinion was maintained by O. Šaxmatov (Bbl. 66), S. Obnorskij (Bbl. 57), P. Žytec'kyj (Bbl. 68) and others. Summarising the opinions of many researchers on this problem one comes to the conclusion that the Common Slavic *ē* (long ē, closer to *a* or diphtong *iè*) symbolized by the letter ѣ in old Ukrainian reflected sound [i] in popular pronunciation. More information on this subject is found in P. Kovaliv's book under Bibl. 52, pp. 81-97.

[2] Most scholars agree that reduced vowels ъ ь in weak position were dropped in the XI century while in strong position they changed to full vowels, ъ > *o*, ь >*e*, somewhat

Reflexes of diphthongs

CSl early period	CSl late period	OUkr (XI-XII c.)	MUkr (XX c.)	Meaning
ei veidŏs	ī vidъ	(i)u видъ /vyd/	и вид /vyd/	view
oi koinā	ě cěna	Ѣ цѣна /c'iná/	i ціна /c'iná/	price
vĭlkoi̯	i vьlci	и вълци /volc'i/	и вовки /vovký/	wolves
eu̯ beu̯dŏn	jū bjudo> bl'udo	ю блюдо /bl'údo/	'у блюдо /bl'údo/	dish
ou̯ tou̯rŏs	ū turъ	оу тоуръ /tur/	у тур /tur/	aurochs

Reflexes of diphthongal combinations

en	sēmen	ę	semę	ѧ > ä[4] сѣмѧ /s'imja/	i сім'я /s'imja/	seed
on	ronka	ǫ	rǫka	оу(ж)[5] роука /ruká/	у рука /ruká/	hand
	goron		gorǫ	/horú/	гору /horú/	mountain (asg.)
un+ϕ	kāmūn (<kamōn)	y	kamy	ы(и) камы /kámy/	i камінь /kámin'/	stone
un+ϕ	plōdŭn (<plōdŏn)	ъ	plodъ	ъ плодъ/plod/	ϕ плід /plid/	fruit

later, probably in the XII c. or even earlier. However, spelling in the OUkr texts does not show a consistency regarding those changes, whether in strong or weak positions. Especially at word-boundaries ъ and ь continued to be used by scribes and copyists much longer.

[3] *ы* and *u* are mixed in almost all the Ukrainian literary monuments of Kyjivan Rus' at its early period, which indicates that the sounds represented by these letters already coincided at that time, i.e., had the same phonemic value.

Reflexes of final consonants with preceding vowels

CSl	OUkr (XI-XII c.)	MUkr (XX c.)	Meaning
ĭn > ь: gostĭn > gostь	гость /hos't'/ (= alien; merchant	гість /his't'/	guest
ŭn > ъ: sūnūn > synъ	сынъ (син) /syn/	син /syn/	son
on (<ŏn) > ъ: vl̥kon > vьlkъ	вълкъ /volk/	вовк /vovk/	wolf
on (<ōn)> y: kamon > kamy	камы (рами) /kámy/	камінь /kámin'/	stone
ins > i: gostins > gosti	гості /hósti/ (= aliens; merchants)	гості /hósti/	guests
ons > y: vl̥kons > vьlky	вълкы (и) /volký/	вовки /vovký/	wolves
uns > y: sūnuns > syny	сыны (сини) /syný/	сини /syný/	sons

[4] Consonants before front vowels represented by the letter ѧ were half-soft; and before back vowels they were hard, hence, before front vowel ѧ they were half-soft and before *a* they were hard. Thus ѧ could not have changed immediately to *a* because in such a case the half-soft consonant *s* would have become hard and the combination *sa, ta* etc. instead of *s'a, t'a* would have resulted. Therefore it is assumed that originally ѧ > ä (front vowel) before which the consonant was half-soft. The vowel *ä* was an independent phoneme but not of full value, because it appeared only in a very limited number of words. Later on, half-soft consonants acquired full softness (about XII c.), while *ä* changed to the front vowel ['a], an allophone of the phoneme /a/.

[5] The letters ѫ and ѧ used in OChSl texts in Kyjivan Rus' denoted nasal vowels *ǫ ę* which existed in all the Slavic languages in their prehistoric and early historic period. They have survived in modern Polish, but they changed to *оу*/u/ and *я, а*/a/ in OUkr probably as early as X c. Numerous cases of their mixture in the early OUkr texts proves that their sound value was /u/ and ['a] and not /ǫ/ and [ę].

Reflexes of changes in consonant clusters

CSL	OUkr (XI—XII c.)	MUkr (XX c.)	Meaning
1. *t d p b* ~ *ϕ* before *s n*:			
ŏpsa >) osa	оса/ osá/	оса /osá/	wasp
gъbnǫti ~ gъnoti	гноути/hnúty/	гнути /hnúty/	to bend
2. *t d* ~ *ϕ* before *m*:			
vědmь > věmь	вѣмь /viem/	знаю /znáju/	I know
3. *kt* ~ *t* before back V:			
plektǫ > pletǫ	плетоу /pletú/	плету /pletú/	I braid
kt ~ *t'* before front V:			
noctĭs ~ notъ	ніч /noč'/	ніч /nič/	night
4. *skn* ~ *sn*:			
plesknǫ >ti) plesnǫ ti	плеснути /plesnúty/	плеснути /plesnúty/	to splash
5. *bv*+C ~ *b*+C:			
obvlačiti > oblačiti	облачити /oblač'ity/	одягнути /od'ahnúty/	to array (in)
6. non-initial *t d* ~ *l*:			
gъrdlo > gъrlo	горло /hórlo/	горло /hórlo/	throat
7. *s* before *r* ~ *str*:			
sruja > struja	строуя /strujá/	струмінь /strúmin'/	stream
8. *z* ~ *ϕ* before *z*:			
bezzakonie > bezakonie	безаконие /bezakónije/	беззаконня /bezzakón'n'a/	lawlessness
9. *zc* ~ *sc* or *c*:			
izcěliti > isceliti	исцѣлити /isc'ilýty/	зцілити /sc'ilýty/	to heal
10. *z* ~ *s* before *p t k x*:			
izkusiti > iskusiti	искусити /iskusýty/	спокусити /spokusýty/	to tempt

Reflexes of non-velars combined with *j*

	CS1	OUkr (XI-XIIc.)	MUkr (XXc.)	Meaning
r+j > r'	mŏrjōd > mor'a	р' моря /mór'a/	моря /mór'a/	of the sea
l+j > l'	vŏljā > vol'a	л' воля /vól'a/	воля /vól'a/	will
n+j > n'	kŏnjŏs> kon'ъ	н' конь /kon'/	кінь /kin'/	horse
s+j > š'	pisjōn> piš'ǫ	ш' пишю /pyš'ú/	пишу /pyšú/	I write
z+j >ž'	vozjenŏs > vož'enъ	ж' воженъ /vóž'en/	вожений /vóženyj/	carried
b+j > bl'	leu̯bjenŏs > l'ubl'enъ	бл' любленъ /l'úbl'en/	люблений /l'úblenyj/	loved
p+j > pl'	kou̯pja > kupl'a	пл' коупля /kúpl'a/	купівля (купля) /kúpl'a/ or /kupívl'a/	buying
u̯+j > vl'	lou̯jā > lovl'a	вл' ловля /lóvl'a/	ловля /lóvl'a/	catching
m+j > ml'	zemjā > zeml'a	мл' земля /zeml'á/	земля /zeml'á/	earth
t+j > s't'	svĕtjā > svĕš't'a	ч' свѣча /svič'a/	свіча /s'vičá/	candle
d+ j > ž'd'	medjā > mež'd'a	ж' межя /mežá/	межа /mež'a/	boundary
s+tj > š't'š'	pou̯stjā > puš't'š'a	щ' поущя /púš'č'a/	пуща /púšča/	dense forest
z+dj > ž'd'ž'	prigvozdjōn > prigvož'd'ž'ǫ	ж' пригвожю /pryhvož'ú/	пригвожджу /pryhvoždžú/	I'll nail
s+lj > š'l'	mūsljonījon > myš'l'enьe	ш'л' мышлєниє /myš'l'én'ije/	мислення /mýslen'n'a/	thinking
z+nj > ž'n'	sŭblaznjōnŏs > sъblaz''n'enъ	з'н' съблазненъ /soblaz'n'én/	спокушений /spokúšenyj/	enticed
d+rj > ž'd'r'	ou̯mondrion > umǫž'd'r'ǫ	др' оумоудрю /umudr'ú/	умудрю /umudr'ú/	I'll make wiser
t+rj > š't'r'	sŭmotrjōn > sъmoš't'r'ǫ	тр' съмотрю /smotr'ú/	дивлюся /dyvl'ús'a/	I look

Reflexes of *tort, tolt, tert, telt*

CSl		OUkr (XI-XIIc.)	MUkr (XXc.)	Meaning
early period	late period			
g*or*dŏs	g*or*dъ	городъ /hórod/	город /hórod/	town, city
g*ol*vā	g*ol*va	голова /holová/	голова /holová/	head
b*er*gŏs	b*er*gъ	берегъ /béreh/	берег /béreh/	bank, shore
m*el*kŏn	m*el*ko	молоко /molokó/	молоко /molokó/	milk
		шеломъ /šelóm/	шолом /šolóm/	helm

Reflexes of *ĭr, ĭl, ŭr, ŭl, ĭm, ŭm, ĭn, ŭn*

CSl		OUkr (XI-XIIc.)	MUkr (XXc.)	Meaning
early period	late period			
ĭr zĭrnŏn	ь̭r̥ zь̭r̥no	зьрно /zérno/	зерно /zérno/	grain
ŭr gŭrdlŏn	ъ̭r̥ gъ̭r̥lo	гърло /hórlo/	горло /hórlo/	throat
ĭl vĭlkŏs	ь̭l̥ vь̭l̥kъ	вълкъ /volk/	вовк /vovk/	wolf
ŭl dŭlgŏs	ъ̭l̥ dъ̭ l̥gъ	дългъ /dolh/	довг /dovh/	debt
ĭv gĭmti	ę žęti	жя(а)ти /žʼáty/	жати /žáty/	to reap
ŭm dŭmti	ǫ dǫti	доути /dúty/	дути /dúty/	to blow
ĭn mĭnti	ę męti	мя(а)ти /mjáty/	м'яти /mjáty/	to rumple
ŭn -un-	ǫ			

Reflexes of consonants[6]

CSl	OUkr	MUkr	CSl	OUkr	MUkr
r	р	/r/	g	г	г(ґ) /h/(/g/)
l	л	/l/	k	к	к /k/
m	м	/m/	ch	х	х /x/
n	н	/n/	s' > s	с	с /s/
b	б	/b/	z' > z	з	з /z/
p	п	/p/	v	в	в /v/
d	д	/d/	j	и	й /j/
t	т	/t/			

Reflexes of the *first palatalization* of the velars[7]

CSl	OUkr (XI-XIIc.)	MUkr (XXc.)	Meaning
k > č' before i, e, ē vl̥ke > vl̥č'e	ч' вовче (v.) /vólč'e/	вовче (v.) /vóvče/	wolf
g > ž' before i, e, ē gena > ž'ena	ж' жена /ž'ená/	жона /žoná/	woman
x > š' before i, e, ē dou̯xe > dou̯š'e	ш' доуше (v.) /duš'ě/	душе (v.) /dušě/	soul
k+j > č' sekja > seč'a	ч' сѣча /s'ič'a/	січа /s'iča/	battle
g+j > ž' lŭgja > lŭž'a	ж' лъжя /lž'a/	лож /lož/	deception
x+j > š' dou̯xja > dou̯š'a	ш' доушя /duš'á/	душа /dušá/	soul

[6] In CSl the hard consonants *t d p b m v r l n s r* before front vowels *i ē ѣ e ь ѧ > ä* were half-soft. However, there is a disagreement among the scholars with regard to the sound quality of these consonants before *e* and *y* (Cyrillic *и*) the latter resulting from the fusion of the etymological ы and *и* /i/ in OUkr. Some scholars thought that hard consonants before these vowels in CSl were soft and later on, in OUkr, they became dispalatalized (A. Šaxmatov, V. Bohorodyc'kyj, A. Sobolevskij, S. Kul'bakin, N. Durnovo, T. Lehr-Spławiński, P. Buzuk and others). Other scholars have defended the view that hard consonants before these vowels were always hard (S. Smal'-Stoc'kyj, Je. Tymčenko, V. Hancov, N. Nimčynov, O. Synjavs'kyj, P. Kovaliv and others). To the author of this

Reflexes of the *second palatalization* of the velars[8]

CSl	OUkr (XI-XIIc.)	MUkr (XXc.)	Meaning
k > c' before ě < oi, i < oi: rǫkě > rǫc'ě (d, l)	ц' роуцѣ /ruc'í/	руці /ruc'í/	to (in) the hand
g > ʒ' nogě > noʒ'ě (d, l)	ʒ' нозѣ /noz'í/	нозі /noz'í/	to (in) the leg
x > s' duxě > dus'ě (l)	с' доусѣ /dús'i/	в дусі /dús'i/	in the spirit
kv > c' květъ > c'větъ	ц' цвѣтъ /c'vit/	цвіт /c'vit/	flower, bloom
gv > ʒ' gvězda > ʒ'vězda	ʒ' звѣзда /z'vizdá/	звізда /z'vizdá/	star
xv > s'v vl̥xvi > vl̥s'vi (npl)	с' вълсви /vóls'vi/ /vólsvy/	волхви /vólxvy/ (чародії) (čarodíji)	wizards

Reflexes of the *third palatalization* of the velars[9]

CSl	OUkr (XI-XIIc.)	MUkr (XXc.)	Meaning
k > c' after i, ь, ę: ovьka > ovьc'a	ц' овьця /ovc'á/	вівця /vivc'á/	sheep
g > ʒ' kъnęgъ > kъnęʒ'ъ	ʒ' кънязь /kn'az'/	князь /kn'az'/	prince
x >s' vьxъ > vьs'ъ	с' вьсь /ves'/	ввесь /vves'/ (увесь) /uves'/	the whole

paper the second view appears more convincing (see also: P. Kovaliv, *Osnovy formuvannja ukrajins'koji movy,* New York-Paris-Sidney-Toronto: Z NTŠ, 1958, pp. 122 - 134).

[7] The first palatalization of the velars took place before the monophthongization of the diphthongs.

[8] The second palatalization of the velars took place after the monophthongization of the diphthongs.

[9]. The third palatalization of the velars took place after the monophthongization of the diphthongs.

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

General Works on Slavic Philology

1. Bernstein S.B., *Očerk sravnitel'noj grammatiki slavjanskix jazykov,* Moskva, 1961.
2. Braun M., *Grundzüge der slavischen Sprachen,* Göttingen, 1947.
3. Bulaxovs'kyj L.A., *Vstup do porivnjal'noji hramatyky slovjans'kyx mov. Fonetyka praslovjans'koji movy,* Xarkiv, 1927.
4. Filin F.P., *Obrazovanie jazyka vostočnyx slavjan,* Moskva-Leningrad, 1962.
5. Fortunatov F.F., *Kratkij öčerk sravnitel'noj fonetiki indoevropejskix jazykov,* Petrograd, 1922.
6. Gornung B.V., *Iz predistorii obrazovanija obščeslavjanskogo jazykovogo jedinstva,* Moskva, 1963.
7. Isačenko, A.V., "Opyt tipologičeskogo analiza slavjanskix jazykov", *Novoe v lingvistike,* No. 3, Moskva, 1963.
8. Ivanov V.V., and Toporov V.M., *K postanovke voprosa o drevnejšyx otnošenijax baltijskix i slavjanskix jazykov,* Moskva, 1958.
9. Kolomyjec' V.T., *Sporidnenist' slovjans'kyx mov,* Kyjiv, 1962.
10. Kondrašov N.A., *Slavjanskie jazyki,* 2nd ed., Moskva, 1962.
11. Kostrzewski J., *Prasłovjańszczyzna,* Poznań, 1946.
12. Kravčuk R.V., *Z istoriji slovjans'koho movoznavstva,* Kyjiv, 1961.
13. Kuznecov P.S., *Voprosy sravnitel'no-istoričeskogo izučenija slavjanskix jazykov,* VJA, 1952, No. 5.
14. Lehr-Spławiński T., *O. pochodzeniu i praojczyznie Slowian,* Poznań, 1946.
15. Lehr-Spławiński T., Kuraszkiewicz W., Sławski F., *Przegląd i charakterystyka języków slowiańskich,* Warszawa, 1954.
16. Meillet A.M., *La slave commun.* Paris, 1924. (In Russian translation: *Obščeslavjanskij jazyk,* 1951.)
17. Mel'nyčuk O.S., editor, *Vstup do porivnjal'noho vyvčennja slovjans'kyx mov,* Kyjiv, 1966.
18. Miklosič F., *Vergleichende Grammatik der slavischen Sprachen,* 2-te Aufl., Wien, 1875 - 1883.
19. Moszyński K., *Pierwszy zasiąg języka prasłowiańskiego,* WrocŁaw Krakow, 1957.
20. Nachtigal R., *Slavjanskie jazyki* (Russian translation), Moskva, 1963.
21. Petrus' V., *Slavjanskaja jazykovaja obščnost',* Moskva: Otdelenie literatury i jazyka, t. X, vyp. 4, 1951.
22. Rudnyc'kyj J.B., *Lekciji z porivnjal'noji hramatyky slovjans'kyx mov,* č. 1, Augsburg, 1948.
23. Shevelov George Y., *A Prehistory of Slavic. The Historical Phonology of Common Slavic,* New York: Columbia University Press, 1965.

24. Sobolevskij A.I., *Materialy i issledovanija v oblasti slavjanskoj filologii i arxeologii,* S-Pbg, 1910.
25. Smal-Stoc'kyj St., *Rozvytok pohljadiv na semju slovjans'kyx mov i jix vzajemne sporidnennja,* Praha, 1927.
26. Sreznevskii I., *Materialy dlja slovarja drevnerussogo jazyka,* Moskva, 1893.
27. Sreznevskii I., *Mysli ob istorii russkogo jazyka i drugix slavjanskix narečij,* Moskva, 1959.
28. Trautman R., *Die Slavische Völker und Sprachen,* Leipzig, 1948.
29. Tret'jakov P.N., *Vostočnoslavjanskie plemena,* Moskva, 2nd ed., 1953.
30. Žuravlev V.K., *Iz istorii vokalizma v praslavjanskom jazyke pozdnego perioda,* V.Ja., 1963, No. 2.

Old Church Slavonic

31. Besedina-Nevzorova V.P., *Staroslavjanskij jazyk,* Xarkiv, 1962.
32. Bielfeldt H.H., *Altslavische Grammatik,* Berlin, 1961.
33. Gorškov A.I., *Staroslavjanskij jazyk,* Moskva, 1963.
34. Jagič V., *Enstehungsgeschichte der kirchenslavischen Sprache,* 2-te Aufl., Berlin, 1913.
35. Lehr-Spławiński T., Bartuła Cz., *Zarys gramatyki języka starocerkiewnoslovjańskiego,* 4-te vyd., Wrocław Krakow, 1959.
36. Leskien A., *Handbuch der altbulgarischen (altkirchenslavischen) Sprache,* 7-te Aufl., Heidelberg, 1955.
37. Lew W., *Narys starocerkovnoslavjans'koji movy,* Stamford, 1956.
38. Lunt A., *Old Church Slavonic Grammar,* 2-nd ed., Haag, 1959.
39. Matveeva-Isaeva L.V., *Lekcii po staroslavjanskomu jazyku,* Leningrad, 1958.
40. Rosenkranz R., *Historische Laut-und Formenlehre des Altbulgarischen (Altkirchenslavischen),* Heidelberg, 1955.
41. Sadnik L. und Aizentmüller R., *Handwörterbuch zu den altkirchenslavischen Texten,* Haag - Heidelberg, 1955.
42. Seliščev A.M., *Staroslavjanskij jazyk,* I-II, Moskva, 1952.
43. Trubetzkoy N., *Altkirchenslavische Grammatik,* Wien, 1954.
44. Van Vejk, *Istorija staroslavjanskogo jazyka* (Russian translation), Moskva, 1957.
45. Vondrak W., *Altkirchenslavische Ukrainian Grammatik,* 2-te Aufl., Berlin, 1912.

Ukrainian

46. Baudouin de Courteny I. "Kilka ogólników o objektywnej i subjektywnej odrębności "Ukrainy" pod względem językowym, plemiennym, narodowym i państwowym", *Z NTŠ,* Lviv, 1925.

47. Bezpalko O.P., Bojčuk M.K., Žovtobrjux M.A., Samijlenko S.P., Taranenko I.J., *Istoryčna hramatyka ukrajins'koji movy,* Kyjiv, 1957.
48. Bulaxovs'kyj L.A., *Pytannja poxodžennja ukrajins'koji movy,* Kyjiv, 1956.
49. Černyx P. Istoričeskaja grammatika russkogo jazyka, Moskva, 1954.
50. Jagič V., "Četyre kritiko-paleografičeskie stat'i", *Sbornik otdelenija russkogo jazyka,* Spb, 1889.
51. Jakubinskij L.A., *Istorija drevnerusskogo jazyka,* Moskva, 1953.
52. Kovaliv P., *Osnovy formuvannja ukrajins'koji movy v porivnjanni z inšymy sxidn'oslovjans'kymy movamy,* New York: Z NTŠ, 1958.
53. Kovaliv P., *Leksyčnyj fond literaturnoji movy Kyjivs'koho periodu X-XIV st.,* New York: Z NTŠ, 1962.
54. Lehr-Spławiński O., *Początki języka ukraińskiego w zarysie,* Warszawa, 1956.
55. Medvedev F.P., *Narysy z ukrajins'koji istoryčnoji hramatyky,* Xarkiv, 1964.
56. Medvedev F.P., *Istoryčna hramatyka ukrajinskoji movy. Korotkyj narys,* č. 1, Xarkiv, 1955.
57. Obnorskij S., *Očerki po istorii russkogo literaturnogo jazyka staršego perioda,* Moskva, Leningrad, 1946.
58. Potebnja A., *Dva issledovanija o zvukax russkogo jazyka,* Voronež, 1866.
59. Rudnyc'kyj J.B., *An Etymological Dictionary of the Ukrainian Language,* Winnipeg: Ukrainian Free Academy of Sciences, 1962-
60. Šerex Yurij (=Shevelov George Y.), *Narys sučasnoji ukrajins'koji literaturnoji movy,* Munich: NTŠ, 1951.
61. Shevelov G.Y., *A Historical Phonology of the Ukrainian Language,* Heidelberg: Carl Winter-Universitätsverlag, 1979; "Consonanten vor *e, i* in den protoukrainischen Dialekten", *Festschrift für Max Fasmer zum 70 Geburtstag,* 1956.
62. Sidorov V.N., "Reducyrovannye glasnye v drevnerusskom jazyke XI v.", *Trudy Instituta jazykoznanija,* izd. AN USSR, t. II, 1953.
63. Tymčenko Je., *Kurs istoriji ukrajins'koho jazyka. Vstup i fonetyka,* Kyjiv: DVU, 1930.
64. Šaxmatov O., Kryms'kyj A., *Narysy z istoriji ukrajins'koji movy,* Kyjiv, 1924.
65. Šaxmatov A.A., "Očerk drevnejšego perioda istorii russkogo jazyka", *Encyclopedija slavjanskoj filologii,* vyp. 2, č. 1, Spb, 1915.
66. Šaxmatov A.A., *Issledovanie v oblasti russkoj fonetiki,* Warszawa, 1903.
67. Ščerbakivs'kyj V., *Holovni riznyci miž ukrajins'koju i rosijs'koju movamy,* London, 1952.
68. Žytec'kyj P., *Očerk zvukovoj istorii malorusskogo narečija,* Kyjiv, 1876.
69. Ziłyns'kyj I., *Opis fonetyczny języka ukraińskiego,* 1932. Introduction, translation and linguistically updated by Wolodymyr Žyla under the title *Phonetic Description of the Ukrainian Language,* Cambridge: UIHU, 1979.

The Term and Name 'Brody' in Western Ukraine

THE ORIGIN OF THE NAME 'BRODY'

The town of *Brody* (Броди) is located in the southern part of Volynia, Western Ukraine, and has belonged to U.S.S.R. since 1945. It also temporarily belonged to U.S.S.R. from 1939 to 1941, i.e., from the end of the German-Polish war to the beginning of the war between Germany and the Soviet Union. From World War I to 1939 it belonged to Poland. From the time of the partition of Poland in the second half of the 18th century to World War I *Brody* was controlled by Austria and due to its location on the border with Russia it played an important role in trading relations between these two empires. The average population of this town from World War I to World War II was approximately 12,500.

1. The name *Brody* is derived from the Common Slavic noun *brodь* (< * brodos) that is also common to all modern Slavic languages:

	Nsg.	Npl.	Meaning
Ukr.	брід (<brodъ)	броди	ford, fording place.[1]

[1] J.B. Rudnyćkyj, An Etymological Dictionary of the Ukrainian Language, v. 3, Winnipeg, 1964.

[2] Академия наук СССР, *Словарь современного русскою хитературного языка,* т. 1, Москва-Ленинград, 1950.

Ru.	брод	-ы	a shallow place of the width of the entire river or pond where one can wade across;[2]
			a shallow place of a river, lake, swamp etc. where one can cross without using bridges, dams, boats, etc.; the conditions of the *brod* are: for the infantry no more than waist-deep, for the calvary no more than stirrup-high.[3]
Bru.	брод	-ы	ford (in a river); track (in grass).[4]
Po.	bród	-y	ford.[5]
Cz.	brod	-y	ford.[6]
Slk.	brod	-y	ford.[7]
UpSo.	bród	-y	ford.[8]
LoSo.	brod	-y	ford.[9]
Bu.	брод	-ове	ford; river crossing.[10]
Ma.	брод	-ові	ford; boat.[11]

[3] Ф. Павленковъ, *Энциклопедическій словарь*, 5 изд., С.-Петербургъ, 1913.

[4] Акадэмія навук Беларускай ССР, *Беларуска-рускі слоунік*, Москва, 1962.

[5] K. Bulas and F.J. Whitfield, *The Kosciuszko Foundation Dictionary, Polish-English*, New York, 1962.

[6] А.И. Павлович, *Чешско-русский словарь*, Москва, 1959.

[7] Julia Vilikovska, *Slovensko-anglicky slovnik*, Bratislava, 1959.

[8] Josef Pata, *Kapesni slovnik lužicko-česko-jihoslovansky*, Praha, 1920.

[9] Bogumił Šwjela, *Dolnoserbsko-němski słownik*, Budyšyn, 1961.

[10] М.И. Йотов и Н.Н. Пономарева, *Краткий болгарско-русский словарь*, Москва, 1960.

[11] Т. Димитровски, Б. Корубин, Т. Стаматоски, *Речних на македонскиот јазик* 1, Скопје, 1961.

Horace G. Lunt, *Grammar of the Macedonian Language*, Skopje, 1952, p. 193.

SC.	brôd	-ovi	boat, ship; ford; place where fish can be caught (e.g. in a lake).[12]
Sln.	brôd	-ovi	ford; ferry, ferry-boat, ship, vessel.[13]

As one can see, the word *brod* in modern Slavic languages has two main meanings: a) ford, fording place; shallow place in a river, lake, etc. that one can cross; b) boat, ship, vessel. Meaning a) is common to all Slavic languages, meaning b) is common to the three Slavic languages: Macedonian, Serbo-Croatian and Slovenian.

2. The nouns *брід* (<brodъ) in modern Ukrainian and *брод* (<brodъ) in modern Russian, have about the same meanings the common noun *бродъ* had in Kyjivan Rus' documents except that its semantic scope in these documents was somewhat broader. According to И.И. Срезневский the word *бродъ*[14]) had the meaning of 'a ford, passageway, way'. To these meanings one should add the following one: a place or terraine less watery or swampy than the adjacent terrain.

The text below justifies our supplement:

> Володимеръ же (поиде) противу имъ (Печенѣгомъ и оусрѣтѣ я на Трубеши *над броду*.[15] кдъ нынѣ Переяславль... (Разбивъ ихъ) Володимѣръ радъ бывъ. и заложи городъ *на броду* томъ и нарче и Переяславль.[16]

It is evident from this context that the word *бродъ* had also the meaning of 'a place or terrain that was less watery or swampy than the

[12] Vuk S. Karadžic, *Srpski rječnik,* rep. Beograd, 1935.

[13] Janko Kotnik, *Slovensko-angleški slovar,* DZS, Ljubljana, 1962.

[14] И.И. Срезневский, *М. для сл. дрр. я.,* т. 1, С.-Перетбургъ, 1893, Москва, 1958.

[15] Н.К. Гудзий, *Христоматия по бревней русской литературе 11-17 вв.,* Москва, 1962, ст. 18: *на бродіь.*

[16] И.И. Срезневский, *М. для сл. дрр. я.,* т. 1, ст. 18, (Пов. вр. л., 6500 г., по Ип. сп.).

Translation: And Volodymyr went against them (Pečenegs) and met them by the Trubeš ford where at present there is the town Perejaslavl'. Volodymyr was glad (at having defeated them) and he founded the city by this ford and gave it the name Perejaslavl'.

adjacent terrain' and therefore could serve as an area for building houses. The word *бродъ* in this text could not mean a ford or shallow place in the water on which the town was built if one takes into consideration the technical possibilities of building houses offered by the civilization of that time.

Here is another text in which the meaning of the word *бродъ* is similar to that given above:

> Придоша (король Угорскій и Изяслав) к рѣцѣ к Санови... король нача ставити полкы своя *на бродѣхъ,* Галичане же противу ставляху своя полкы..... а Изяславъ поиде своими полкы горѣ *на броды* и тако шедъ ста выше короля *на* другом *бродѣ,* инии же полкы Угорстии мнози идоша мимо Изяслава, вышьше Изяслава *на броды...*[17]

3. Thus the nominative plural *броди* denoted: a) more than one shallow place in the water, probably many such places, i.e., many fording places where one could cross on foot or horse; b) places or terrain that were less watery or swampy than the adjacent terrain and served as a crossing and were relatively suitable for building. The common noun *броди* with the meaning under b) gave *mutatis mutandis* its name to the town *Броди* (Brody) i.e., the name *Brody* presents a lexical-semantic type of word-building.

4. The original area, that was first populated and on which the houses were built, most probably extended from west to east. This is evidenced by the geographical features of the town *Brody* today: the above-mentioned area is slightly higher than the adjacent terrain and is relatively dry in comparison with that somewhat swampy area.

Due to its location on the trade route from West to East, i.e., from

[17] Ibid., (Ип. л. 6660).

Translation: The Hungarian king and Izjaslav came to the San River... the king started putting his forces on the fords, and Galicians were putting their forces opposite. Izjaslav then went with his forces up to the fords and while doing this he stopped on the other ford higher than the one on which the king's forces stood; and a great number of other Hungarian forces passed by Izjaslav (and went) up into the fords higher in comparison to where Izjaslav was.

Regensburg via Prague, Cracow, Lviv and on to Kyjivan Rus' the populated locality *Brody* began to grow and extend to the north and west.

This new part of the settlement was then also called Brody, and the original locality received the name *Старі Броди* (Stari Brody) meaning 'Old Brody'. It is difficult to determine historically the onset of this distinction because the new extended part with the name Brody outgrew considerably Stari Brody and history has recorded only the name *Brody* without retaining the adjective "Stari". *Brody* became a handicraft and trading centre for the surrounding farming area, and *Stari Brody* took on the appearance of a village, and farming became the principal occupation of its inhabitants.

5. FIRST APPEARANCE OF THE NAME "BRODY" IN THE KYJIVAN RUS' DOCUMENT

Brody is a very old town. This name appears for the first time in the Kyjivan Rus' document 'Пооученьє' (The Precepts) written by Volodymyr Monomax about the end of the first quarter of the 12th century. However, the events in connection with which the name *Brody* is mentioned in this document go as far back as the end of the third and the beginning of the fourth quarter of the 11th century. When enumerating some of his 83 campaigns, Volodymyr Monomax[18] also mentioned that in the spring he went to *Brody* to meet Joropolk there.

и на ту весну. къ Ярополку
совкупляться *на Броды.*[19]

In another place it reads:

на ту зиму идохо^{М} къ Ярополку
совокуплятися *на Броды.* и любовь
велику створихо^{М}.[20]

History recorded the first event in 1084. Volodar Rostyslavyč

[18] Volodymyr Monomax was a great prince of Kyjivan Rus' from 1113 to 1125.

[19] Академия наук СССР, 'Л. л. по ак. сп.', *П. с. р. л.*, т. 1, Москва, 1962, ст. 248.
Translation: And in that spring (I went) to Brody to meet Jaropolk.

[20] Ibid.
Translation: In that winter we went to Brody to meet Jaropolk, and we made great friends with each other.

Peremyšl's'kyj and Vasylko Rostyslavyč Terebovel's'kyj expelled Jaropolk Izjaslavyč from the city of Volodymyr Volyns'kyj. The Kyjivan prince Vsevolod Monomax ordered his son Volodymyr to expell the two Rostyslavyčs from Volodymyr Volyns'kyj and to restore Jaropolk to his position there. To fulfill this mission Volodymyr went to Brody to meet his cousin Jaropolk.

The second event was in 1086. Under the influence of wicked advisers, Jaropolk wanted to go against Vsevolod Monomax. Vsevolod sent his son Volodymyr against Jaropolk. The latter escaped to Poland. Volodymyr took Jaropolk's wife, mother and fortune to Kyjiv. It resulted in Jaropolk's return from Poland and the meeting with Volodymyr in Brody. There they became great friends and Volodymyr restored his cousin to the throne in the city of Volodymyr Volyns'kyj.

6. As it appears in 'Поученьє' the name *Brody* was already, at that time, the proper name of the town and not a common noun. This is indicated by two facts: a) this name is capitalized; b) while speaking of his meeting with Jaropolk in Brody, Volodymyr Monomax just mentioned this name without giving any detailed information about its location which would have been necessary had he had in mind *brody,* i.e. fording places or terrain less watery or swampy than the adjacent region, because there were many other *brody* with this meaning. Furthermore, 'Поученьє' was intended not only for Volodymyr's children, but also for the citizens of Kyjivan Rus' at large to whom such information would have been necessary.

7. The question arises why in both passages in 'Поученьє' after the verb of motion (expressed or understood) the preposition *на* is used with the name *Броды*. In Kyjivan Rus' documents either the preposition *въ* (or *в*) (seldom *оу*) + acc. c. of the name of the town, or the preposition *къ* (or *к*) were used to indicate direction toward the town + implication of entering the town.

a. *въ* (or *в*) + acc. c. of the name of the town:

Приде археп^с^пъ Іоа(нъ) *въ* Новъгородъ.[21]

[21] И.И. Срезневский, *М. для сл. дрр. я.*, т. 1, ст. 323, (Новг. 1 л. 6618 г.).

и пришедъ Мстиславъ *в* Переяславль.
поима жену свою и иде *в* Луческъ.[22]
Изяслав же вниде *в* Кыєвъ.[23]
и възвратися *в* Кыєвъ а зять
єго иде *в* Галичь.[24]

Many similar examples can be quoted.

b. *къ* (or *к*) + dat. c. of the name of the town:

...*к* Ростову идохъ...[25]
и пакы... *к* Смолиньску.[26]
... и отиде *к* Берестию.[27]
а и- Смолиньска тои же зимѣ та *к* Новугороду.[28]
Иде Ольга въ Гръкы и придє *к* Царюграду.[29]

Many similar examples can be quoted.

c. Dat. c. of the name of the town without the preposition *къ* (or *к*):

Ярослав же собравъ воя многы Варягы и
Словены. и приидє *Кыеву*.[30]
и възвратишася *Кыеву*.[31]
ї иде Володимеръ опять *Чернѣгову*.[32]
та иходъ *Переяславлю* отцю.[33]
и пакы и- Смолиньска къ отцю
придоˣ *Чернигову*.[34]

Many similar examples can be quoted.

8a. The preposition *на* when used with the verbs *ходити, ити,* (to go), *устрѣмитися* (to rush), *послати* (to send) or similar verbs and

[22] Академия Наук СССР, 'С. л. по Л. сп.', *П. с. р. л.* т. 1, Москва, 1962, ст. 343.
[23] Ibid., ст. 344.
[24] Ibid., ст. 347.
[25] Ibid., ст. 247.
[26] Ibid.
[27] Ibid.
[28] Ibid.
[29] Академия Наук СССР, 'Ип. л.', *П. с. р. л.*, т. 2, Москва, 1962, ст. 49.
[30] Ibid., ст. 138.
[31] Ibid., ст. 162.
[32] Ibid., ст. 197.
[33] Академия наук СССР, 'Л. л. по ак. сп.', *П. с. р. л.*, т. Москва, 1962. ст. 247.
[34] Ibid.

the acc. c. of the name of the town without the dat. c. of the name of another town, had the following meaning: direction toward the town + final objective, i.e. the arrival at and the capture or conquest of the town. In such expressions the subject of the action, indicating a person, usually denoted a prince or a main leader of the campaign.

> Въ лѣто 6718. Того же лѣта ходи Всеволодъ
> *на Рязань*... и ту я изма, и посла пълкы,
> изма жены и дъти, а градъ ихъ зажьже;[35]

Prince Vsevolod campaigned against the town Rjazan' ('на Рязань') and burned it down.

> Ольга же оустрѣмися съ сыном своимъ.
> *на Искоростѣнь городъ*. яко тѣ бяху
> оубилъ мужа єя. и ста около город съ
> сыномъ своимъ. а Дєревлянє затворишася
> в городѣ. и боряху крѣпько из города.[36]

The princess Olha campaigned against the town Iskorosten' ('на Искоростѣнь') with the intention of capturing it, which is expressed by the verb *оустрѣмися* + *на Искоростѣнь* and is clarified by the sentence:

> *а Дєревлянє затворишася в городѣ и боряху крѣпько из города.*

Here is another example:

> и сына своєго Изявлава ис Курьска. с свои^{М} полко^{М} посла и *на Логожескъ*. а другаго сына своєго Рости[сла]ва посла с Смолняны. на *Дрьютескъ*. рекъ имъ в одинъ дьнь всъ^{М} пустити на воропъ.[37]

This passage refers to the campaign of Mstyslav Volodymyrovyč against the Polock princes, 1128. Mstyslav ordered his son Izjaslav from Kursk to campaign against the town Logožesk ('на Логожескъ') and his other son Rostyslav to campaign against the town Drjutesk ('на

[35] G.Y. Shevelov and F. Holling, 'From the Novgorod Chronicle According to the Synodal Copy', *A Reader in the History of the Eastern Slavic Language*, New York, 1958, p. 9.

[36] Академия наук СССР, 'Ип, л.', *П. с. р. л.*, т. 2, Москва, 1962, ст. 46.

[37] Академия наук СССР, 'С. л. по Л. сп.', *П. с. р. л.*, т. 1, Москва, 1962, ст. 298.

Дрьютескъ'). Here again the preposition *на* + acc. c. of the names of the towns in combination with the verb *посла* indicates the direction toward the town + final objective of the action, i.e. the arrival at and the capture of conquest of the town. The implication of this objective in this expression is supported by the sentence *рекъ имъ в одинъ день всѣмъ пустити на воропъ* (told them to advance to attack in one day).

Another example:

> пожалиси Добрына и исполнися ярости. и поємше вои [и] идоша *на Полтескъ*. и побъдиста Роговолода.[38]

Sometimes a secondary predicate expressed by the present active participle such as *воюя* or similar one was used with the name of the town with the preceding preposition *на* to mark the final objective, e.g.:

> онъ иде Новугороду. и я с Половци
> *на Одрьскъ воюя* та Чернигову.[39]
> *та на Дрьютьскъ воюя.* та Чернигову.[40]

Thus the preposition *на* when used in the construction under 8a. had the meaning similar to the preposition *на* in such constructions as *ити на Всеволода*[41] (to campaign against Vsevolod), *ходихомъ на Глеба*[42] (we campaigned against Gleb), *Володимиръ иде на Грекы*[43] (Volodymyr campaigned against the Greeks), in which the acc. c. of the name of a person (usually prince or leader as opponent) or of the people (considered as enemies) replaced the acc. c. of the name of a town. The only difference between the preposition *на* in the two constructions lay in the strengthening of the objective of the action on account of the weakening of the direction in the second construction.

8b. The preposition *на* when used with the verbs *ходити, ити,* and similar verbs + acc. c. of the name of the town + dat. c. of the name of another town (with or without the preceding preposition *къ* (or *к*)

[38] Ibid., ст. 300.
[39] Академия наук СССР, 'Л. л. по ак. сп.', *П. с. р. л.,* т. 1, Москва, 1962, ст. 247.
[40] Ibid., ст. 248.
[41] Академия наук СССР, 'С. л. по Л. сп.', *П. с. р. л.,* т. 1, Москва, 1962, ст. 250.
[42] Академия наук СССР, 'Л. л. по ак. сп.', *П. с. р. л.,* т. 1, Москва, 1962 ст. 250.
[43] И.И. Срезневский, *М. для сл. дрр. я.,* т. 2, ст. 260, (Новг. 1 л. 6555 г.).

had the meaning of 'route', 'via', 'through' since the final objective was the arrival at and the capture or conquest of the *second* town. This final objective could be implied, depending on the context, e.g.:

> а Всеволоду Огливичю повелѣ ити
> с своєю бра$^{\text{т}}$єю *на Стѣжевъ* к Борисову.[44]

This passage refers to the campaign of Mstyslav Volodymyrovyč, the main leader mentioned above, who ordered Vsevolod Olhovyč to campaign against the town, Borysov, the route to which led through the town, Strežev. The objective of the action *повелѣ ити* was the arrival at and the capture of the town Borysov; and Strežev indicated a marked point on the route of the campaign.

9. In the expression *на Броды* in the text quoted from 'Поученьє' under 5. the preposition *на* has neither the full meaning indicated under 8a. nor under 8b.

Let us take the first sentence quoted from 'Поученьє' and pertaining to *Brody*. The possibilities of the syntax of this sentence can be presented in the following three diagrams:

a. **Subject** (understood) Язъ (азъ, я) — **Predicate** (understood) ходихъ

when?	to whom?	what for?
на ту весну	къ Ярополку	совкупляться
in that spring	to Jaropolk	(съ Ярополькомъ)
		to unite with
		or to meet
		(Jaropolk)
		against whom?
		what?
		на Броды
		against Brody

Here *на Броды* would mean: direction toward the town + final objective, i.e. the arrival at and the capture or conquest of the town according to the explanation under 8a. But such a campaign of Volo-

[44] Академия наук СССР, 'Л. л. по ак. сп.', *П. с. р. л.*, т. 1, Москва, 1962, ст. 297, 298.

dymyr Monomax and Jaropolk against Brody is unknown in history. Brody has never been a capital of a principality of a seat of a prince of Rus' and had never been the objective of a campaign of one prince against the other. Consequently, *на Броды* could not have the meaning 'against Brody' given under 8a.

b. **Subject** **Predicate**
(understood) (understood)
Язъ (азъ, я) ходихъ

when?

where to?

to whom?

на ту весну what for?

на Броды
through Brody

совкупляться
(съ Ярополкомъ)
къ Ярополку

Here *на Броды* would mean 'through' the town as indicated under 8b. In such a case Brody would not indicate the marked place where Volodymyr and Jaropolk met each other. But the indication of such a place was very important, perhaps more important than the indication of the route Volodymyr used, if one keeps in mind that 'Пооученьє' was intended not only for Volodymyr's children, but for the people of Kyjivan Rus' at large. It means that Volodymyr would have mentioned the name of the locality in which he had met Jaropolk if this locality had been another one than Brody.

c. This leads us to the acceptance of the third possibility, i.e. Volodymyr Monomax and Jaropolk met in Brody.

Subject **Predicate**
(understood) (understood)
Язъ (азъ, я) ходихъ

when?

where to? what for?

to whom?

на ту весну

кь Ярополку
на Броды совкупляться
to Brody (съ Ярополкомъ)

Thus the preposition *на* in the expression *на Броды* in the quoted text corresponds with the preposition *въ* (or *в*) or *къ* (or *к*), or no preposition + dat. c. of Brody so that the expression *на Броды* had the meaning *въ* (or *в*) *Броды*, or *къ* (or *к*) *Бродомъ*, or *Бродомъ*.

10. The exceptional use of the preposition *на* in combination with the name of the town Brody with the above meanings had its reasons:

a. This preposition first was used with the common noun *броды* (the terrain less watery or swampy than the adjacent region) and indicated direction *onto* the surface of *the brody* ('на броды') and not *into the brody* ('*въ* [or *в*] броды').

b. When speaking of *броди* (as a common noun), one had the notion of an open and a relatively unlimited geographical area rather than the notion of a place or locality administratively limited and characteristic, for instance, of a town. To render the first notion the preposition *на* was used, and to convey the latter one the prepositions *въ* (or *в*), or *къ* (or *к*) were used. It was spoken: ити, поити, etc., *на броды,*[45] *на море,*[46] *на поле,*[47] *на Сулу* (river),[48] etc.

After the common noun *броди* began to be used as a proper name of the town *Броди,* the traditional usage ити *на броды,* поити *на броды,* etc. was *mutatis mutandis* applied to the new semantic formation ити *на Броды,* поити *на Броды,* etc. with the meaning ити, поити, etc. *въ* (or *в*) *Броды* or *къ* (or *к*) *Бродомъ* or *Бродомъ.* At the time Volodymyr Monomax wrote his 'Пооученьє' this traditional usage in the new semantic formation was evidently very strong.

Although the first mention of the town Brody goes back to the 11th century, one can assume that it must have existed already in the more remote past because:

[45] See pp. 8, 9.

[46] И.И. Срезневский, *М. для сл. дрр. я.*, т, 2, ст. 260, (П. вр. л. 6608 г.).

[47] Ibid., ст. 261, (Новг. 1 л. 6666 г.).

[48] Академия наук СССР, 'Л. л. по ак. сп.', *П. с. р. л.*, т. 1, Москва, 1962, ст. 248.

a) it was located on the very old and important trade route from Regensburg to Kyjiv; b) at the time Volodymyr wrote his 'Пооученьє', Brody must have been very well known to his readers, i.e. it must have been an urban development of some size, which did require a long period of development.

DERIVATIVES

In the Ukrainian language many derivatives were built from the appellative *брід*, from the verb *бродúти* and its derivatives and from the geographical names.

11. *Derivatives from the appellative 'брід'.*

Appellatives

a. *нáбрід* — influx of strangers (foreigners); rabble, mob.

b. Diminutives:

бродóк, бродóчок[49] — a small ford.

брідóк, брідóчок[50] — a small ford.

c. Augmentative:

бродúсько — a large ford.

Proper names

Geographical names:

Брідкú,[51] *Брідóк,*[52] *Бродéцьке,*[53] *Брóдів,*[54] *Брóдово,*[55] *Брó(д)ниця,*[56] *Брóди,*[57] *Брóдина*[58] *Краснобрíд.*[59]

[49] This is a regular formation with the etymological *o* in the root.

[50] This is an irregular formation with the non-etymological *i* in the root.

[51] J.B. Rudnyćkyj, *An Etymological Dictionary of the Ukrainian Language*, v. 3, Winnipeg, 1964, p. 211.

[52] Ibid.

[53] Ibid.

[54] Ibid.

[55] Ibid.

[56] A village, about 37 miles south-west of Lviv.

[57] See: The origin of the name 'Brody'.

[58] A village, about 34 miles south-west of Černivci.

[59] A town, about 57 miles north-west of Lviv.

Adjectives

бріднявий, -а, -е — somewhat dirty.
бродовий, -а, -е — related to 'брід'.

Verb

бродити[60] — to wade; to roam, to rove, to wander, to ramble, to stroll; to ferment.

Adverb

бродом — by fording, wading.

12. *Derivatives from the verb 'бродити'.*

Proper names

Family name:
Бродій.

Verbs

забродити — to come wading in, to come (drop) in; to go astray; to start fermenting.
колобродити — to walk aimlessly, to stroll.
набродитися[61] — to wade through water for a long time; to wander about (till one is tired).
перебрбджувати — to wade through, to be wading through.
перебродити — to have waded through; to be finished fermenting, to have fermented; to ferment too much.

Deverbative appellatives

derived from the verb *'бродити'* and from some of the verbs given above.

бродяга[62] — a vagrant, a vagabond, a wanderer.

[60] бродити (< * broditi) is an alophonic formation to
брести (< * bredti) — to wade, to ford, to lounge, to shamble; to make one's way; to toil, to drag oneself along; also: to talk nonsense, to prattle.

[61] In modern Ukrainian this middle-reflexive verb is used only in the perfective aspect and only with the prefix *на-* (i.e. бродитися) was also used.

[62] From the stem *бродяг* — with the aid of suffixes and the consonant mutation г > ж the following words were built: the diminutive *бродяжка,* the verb *бродяжити* (to vagabondize, to be on the tramp, to tramp, to hit the trail), and the adjective *бродяжный* (wandering); the stem of the adjective *бродяжний* in its turn served to form

бро́дники[63]	
забрі́д	— vagabondage, vagrancy, wanderings (especially in search of work); catch of fish; fish-pond (reservoir).
забро́да[64]	— a vagabond, a vagrant, a tramp.
забро́дник	— a worker at a fish-reservoir (or in a fish-boat).
перебрі́д	— wading through.
броді́ння	— fermentation.
броди́ло	— ferment, leaven.

Proper names

derived from some of the appellatives given above.

Family names:

Бродни́цький[65]	< *бро́дники*	(see above).
Забро́дський.	< *забро́да*	(see above).

Adjectives

бродя́чий,[66] *-а, -е*	— vagrant, itinerant, migratory.
броди́льний, -а, -е	— fermenting.

13. *Derivatives from the geographical names.*

Proper names

a. Geographical names:

Брі́дщина[67]

the adjective *бродя́жницький* (wandering; of a vagabond), and the abstract noun *бродя́жництво* (tramping, vagabondism, vagabondage, vagrancy).

[63] Different vagrant tribes living in the steppe-belt, north of the Black Sea, in the 12-13 centuries. Most of them were Christians of East Slavic origin.

[64] The formation of this appellative from the verb *забродити* was accompanied by the change of the semantics of the stem of this verb.

[65] The possibility of the derivation of this family name from the name of the village *Бро́(д)ниця* is not excluded.

[66] This is a morphological-syntactical word-building. The adjective *бродя́чий* presents the original adjectival active participle of the present tense, that lost its participial features. This transition was accompanied by a change of the semantics of the participle (cf. participle *бродя́чий,* meaning 'fording, wading', and the adjective *бродя́чий* with the meaning given above).

[67] This is an ethnographical territory corresponding to the administrative one with

Брідський повіт, район — County of Brody
Руда́ Брідська[68]
Старі Бро́ди[69]
Гаї Старобрідські[70]

b. Family names:
Брі́цький < Бро́ди
Броде́цький < Броде́цьке
Бродо́вич < Бро́дів (or Бро́ди)
Бро́диський < Бро́ди

14. *Proverb*

Не спита́єш бро́ду, не лізь у во́ду.

(literally: Don't plunge into the water without having asked (about) the ford, i.e. Look before you leap).

ABBVREVIATIONS

acc. c.	accusative case
Bru.	Belorussian
Bu.	Bulgarian
Cz.	Czech
dat. c.	dative case
g.	god (year)
Ibid.	Ibidem
Ип. л.	Ипатьевская летопись
Пи. сп.	Ипатьевский список
Л. л. по ак. сп.	Лаврентьевская летопись по академическому списку

the town of Brody as its urban center; cf. Полтавщина (urban center — Полта́ва). Київщина (urban center — Ки́їв), Львівщина (urban center — Львів).

[68] A village, about 9-1/3 miles west of Brody.

[69] See: The origin of the name 'Brody'.

[70] A village, about 3-1/2 miles south-east of Brody.

LoSo.	Lower Sorbian
Ma.	Macedonian
М. для сл. дрр. я.	Материалы для словаря древнерусского языка
Новг. л.	Новгородская летопись
Npl.	Nominative plural
Nsg.	Nominative singular
p.	page
Po.	Polish
Пов. вр. л.	Повесть временных лет
П. с. р. л.	Полное собрание русских летописей
rep.	reprint
Ru.	Russian
SC.	Serbian-Croatian
Slk.	Slovakian
Sln.	Slovenian
С. л. по Л. сп.	Суздальская летопись по Лаврентьевскому списку
ст.	страница
Ukr.	Ukrainian
UpSo.	Upper Sorbian (Lusatian)
вв.	веков

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Акадэмія навук Беларускай ССР, *Беларуска-рускі слоунік,* Москва, 1962.
2. Академия наук СССР, *Полное собрание русских летописей,* тт. 1, 2, Москва, 1962.
3. Академия наук СССР, *Словарь современного русского литературного языка,* т. 1, Москва-Ленинград, 1950.
4. Академия наук Украинской ССР, *Украинско-русский словарь,* т. 1, Киев, 1953.
5. Andrusyshen, C.H. and Krett, J.N., *Українсько-англійський словник,* University of Toronto Press, 1957.

6. Bogatek, F.A., *English-Croatian and Croatian-English Dictionary,* Pittsburgh, 1926.
7. Brückner, A., *Słownik etymologiczny języka polskiego,* Cracow, 1927.
8. Bulas, K. and Whitfield, F.J., *The Kosciuszko Foundation Dictionary, Polish-English,* New York, 1962.
9. Даль, В., *Толковый словарь живаго великорусскаго языка,* т. 1, С.-Петербургъ-Москва, 1880, rep. Москва, 1956.
10. Димитровски, Т., Корубин, Б., Стаматоски, Т., *Речник на македонскиот јазык,* 1, Скопје, 1961.
11. Dworecki, I.H., *Słownik rosyjsko-polski,* Warsaw, 1949.
12. Grekow, N.I. i Rozwadowska, M.F., *Słownik polsko-rosyjski,* Warsaw, 1949.
13. Гудзий, Н.К., *Хрестоматия по древней русской литературе* 11-17 вв., Москва, 1962.
14. Нога, К., *Bulgarsko-česky slownik,* Praha, 1959.
15. Грінченко, Б.Д. *Словар української мови,* т. 1, Київ, 1907.
16. Hrushevsky, M., *A History of Ukraine,* New Haven, 1941.
17. Йотов, М.И., и Пономарева, Н.Н., *Краткий болгарско-русский словарь,* Москва, 1960.
18. Karadžič, V.S., *Srpski rječnik,* Beograd, 19356.
19. Kotnik, J., *Slovensko-angleški slovar',* DZS, 1959.
20. Кузеля, З. і Рудницький, Я.Б., *Українсько-німецький словник,* Ляйпціг, 1943.
21. Linde, M.S.B., *Słownik języka polskiego,* Lwów, 1859.
22. Lunt, H.G., *Grammar of the Macedonian Language,* Скопје, 1952.
23. Мюллер, В.К., *Англо-русский словарь,* Москва, 1956.
24. Ожегов, С.И., *Словарь русского языка,* Москва, 1960.
25. Pata, J., *Kopesni slovnik lužecko-česko-jihoslovansky,* Praha, 1920.
26. Павленковъ, Ф., *Энциклопедический словарь,* 5 изд., С.-Петербургъ, 1913.
27. Павлович, А.И., *Чешско-русский словарь,* Москва, 1959,
28. Попович, *Речник српскога и немачкога језика,* Београд, 1926.
29. Rudnyc'kyj, J.B., *An Etymological Dictionary of the Ukrainian Language,* v. 3, Winnipeg, 1964.
30. Ševčenko Scientific Society, *Ukraine, A Concise Encyclopedia,* v. 1, University of Toronto Press, 1963.
31. Shevelov, G.Y. and Holling, F., *A Reader in the History of the Eastern Slavic Languages,* New York, 1958.
32. Sławski, Fr., *Słownik etymologiczny języka polskiego,* t. 1, Cracow, 1952.
33. Смирницкий, А.И., *Русско-английский словарь,* Москва, 1959.
34. Срезневский, И.И., *Материалы для словаря древнерусского языка,* тт. 1, 2, С.-Петербургъ, 1893, rep. Москва, 1958.

35. Šwjela, B., *Dolnoserbsko-němski słownik,* Budyšyn, 1961.
36. Talmantas, J., *Lenku-lietuviu kalbu zodynas,* Vilnius, 1955.
37. Tixomirov, M., *The Towns of Ancient Rus',* Moscow, 1959.
38. Толстой, И.И., *Сербско-харватско-русский словарь,* Москва, 1958.
39. Vasmer, M. *Russisches Etymologisches Wörterbuch,* Heidelberg, 1953.
40. Vilikovska, J., *Slovensko-anglicky slovnik,* Bratislava, 1953.
41. Vydra, B., *Česko-polsky slovnik,* Praha, 1953.
42. "Історія назв: Броди", *Українська Думка,* Лондон, ч. 12 (937), 18. 3. 1965, стор. 8.

On Hard/Soft Labial Consonants In Modern Standard East Slavic Languages

According to the opinion of many scholars the consonants /p b v m/[1] of the East Slavic languages in their pre-written period were non-palatalized and could appear as non-palatalized allophones before non-front vowels and as half-soft allophones before front vowels,[2] suggesting

[1] The symbols used in this article are those customary in linguistic writing: / / indicate phonemic transcription, [ ] phonetic transcription. An apostrophe at the right of the letter indicates softness of the consonant phoneme for which that letter stands. In Ukrainian, an apostrophe after labial *p, b, v, f, m,* before iotacized vowels *я, ю, е, ї* (ja, ju, je, ji) indicates that the phonemes represented by these letters are hard (non-palatalized). A form in parenthesis denotes transliterated Cyrillic spelling or an English equivalent. Abbreviations used in this paper are: adj.=adjective, aff.=affectionate, attr.=attributive, dim.=diminutive, Nsg.=nominative singular, Gsg.=genitive singular, undl.=underlined, trsl.=translated.

[2] This phenomenon also refers to all other consonants in that position except for those which were already fully palatalized as a result of the three palatalizations, and except for /k g x/ which were hard in the Slavic languages. See: I.I. Ivanov, *Istoričeskaja grammatika russkogo jazyka,* Moskva, 1964, pp. 152, 172. Ivanov was inclined to think that such palatalization lasted until the 11 - 12 centuries. P.Ja. Černyx held that all half-soft consonants in this position, that is, before *i, ě, ь* and nasal *e* became soft in East Slavic before the appearance of the Cyrillic written language in Kyjivan Rus'; see his *Istoričeskaja grammatika russkogo jazyka,* Moskva, 1962, pp. 92 - 93. The same opinion was expressed by N. Durnovo; see his *Očerk istorii russkogo jazyka,* S. Gravenhage, 1962 (photomech. reprint, izd. Moskva-Leningrad, 1924), p. 144; M.A. Sokolova, *Očerki po istoričeskoj grammatike russkogo jazyka,* Leningrad, 1962, p. 29, and other scholars.

that at times they had not been contrastive non-palatalized: palatalized phonemes /p - p'/, /b - b'/, /v - v'/, /m - m'/,[3] but that later the half-palatalized consonants in position before front vowels became fully palatalized. However, the phonemic contrast with non-palatalized /p b v m/ could take place only before /a/ (from nasal *e*) in a very limited number of words. The expansion of that contrast to other positions took place after the reduced vowels ъ ь in weak position were dropped following the labial consonants. However, after the fall of the reduced vowels, the labials in Ukrainian became dispalatalized, first at the end of the words (cf. holubь→holub) and later in other positions (the whole process being completed before XIV century),[4] as distinct from Russian and Belorussian, where the contrast in non-palatalized:palatalized remained unchaged. The question is: are labial consonants in contemporary Ukrainian, Belorussian and Russian independent phonemes presenting contrastive pairs of non-palatalized:palatalized consonants or do they only appear to be a correlation of phonemes, where the palatalized are allophones of non-palatalized.

It is worth examining this problem because along with the generally accepted opinion that in Ukrainian there are only non-palatalized labial consonant phonemes, while in the two other East Slavic languages, Russian and Belorussian, there exist contrastive pairs of non-palatalized: palatalized, some scholars assert that labial consonants in all modern Slavic languages are non-palatalized and do not have their palatalized counterparts. Such an opinion was maintained by late Pantalejmon Kovaliv, one of the prominent Ukrainian philologists, and by some of his followers.[5] On somewhat shaky ground stood Synjavs'kyj. He consi-

[3] The phoneme /f/ appeared later.

[4] According to E. Karskij, the dispalatalization of labial consonants in Ukrainian and in south Belorussian dialects took place first before /e/, then before /i/. Later the other consonants before these vowels became hard also; see his treatise "K voprosu ob otverdenii (neumjagčitel'nosti) zvukov *e, i* v malorusskom narečii", *Izbornik Kievskij,* 1904, pp. 83 - 87. However, some scholars maintain that in Ukrainian, consonants before *e* and *i* were always hard, even in its prehistoric period (see Kovaliv P., *Osnovy formuvannia ukrajins'koji movy v porivnjanni z inšymy sxidn'oslovjans'kymy movamy,* New York: Z NTŠ, 1958, pp. 122 - 134).

[5] Pantalejmon Kovaliv, "Problema slovjans'koho konsonantyzmu" in *Symbolae in honorem Georgii Y. Shevelov,* München, Ukrainian Free University, 1971, pp. 238 - 243.

dered palatalized labial consonants to be phonemes, but at the same time he maintained that they "have no distinct phonemic value."[6] According to Tymčenko only hard labials /b p v f m/ are independent phonemes.[7] Moskalenko accepted five non-palatalized phonemes, as Tymčenko, but added one palatalized /v′/,[8] which means that he accepted four unpaired phonemes and one paired. Dejna excluded from the five phonemes the sound [f].[9] Šylo considered five paired labials as separate phonemes /p - p′/, /b - b′/, /v - v′/, /m - m′/, and /f - f′/.[10]

The system of consonant phonemes defined by Tymčenko was accepted by most phoneticians, and after its approval by Bulaxovs'kyj in 1951,[11] it was included in the chapter of phonetics in manuals for pedagogical institutes and universities in the U.S.S.R. However, in most of those manuals, if not in all of them, the description of phonology was made in the traditional way used before 1920. The authors described only the phonetic aspect of the sounds, that is, their physiological-acoustic features; as far as phonemics is concerned, they at best alluded to it. Moreover, in Ukrainian they used an apostrophe for marking *soft* (mjaki) consonants, *softened* (pomjakšeni) and *half-soft* (napivpomjakšeni) consonants; as a result, one obtains a very unclear picture regarding contrastive pairs of non-palatalized:palatalized labials from the point of view of their phonemic quality and function.[12]

[6] O.N. Synjavs'kyj, "Sproba zvukovoji xarakterystyky literaturnoji ukrajins'koji movy" in: *Naukovi zapysky Xarkivs'koji n.-d. kafedry movoznavstva,* No. 2, 1929.

[7] Je.K. Tymčenko, *Kurs istoriji ukrajins'koho jazyka. Vstup i fonetyka,* DVU, 1927, pp. 46 - 50.

[8] A.A. Moskalenko, *Fonetyka sučasnoji ukrajins'koji literaturnoji movy,* Odesa, 1947, pp. 14 - 17.

[9] K. Dejna, "Fonologiczny system języka ukraińskiego" i *Biuletyn Polskiego Towarzystwa Językoznawczego,* Zeszyt X, 1950, p. 149.

[10] H.F. Šylo, "Palatohramy ukrajins'kyx zvukiv i systema fonem ukrajins'koji movy" in: *Voprosy slavjanskogo jazykoznanija,* kn. 1, Lviv, 1948, p. 230.

[11] *Kurs sučasnoji ukrajins'koji movy,* v. 1, za redakcijeju L.A. Bulaxovs'koho, Kyjiv, 1951, pp. 144 - 149.

[12] M.P. Ivčenko, *Sučasna ukrajins'ka literaturna mova,* Kyjiv, 1965, p. 147; Žovtobrjux and B.M. Kulyk, *Kurs sučasnoji ukrajins'koji literaturnoji movy,* čast' 1, Kyjiv, 1965; M.A. Žovtobrjux, *Sučasna ukrajins'ka literaturna mova,* Kyjiv, 1961, pp. 82, 102 -103; O.M. Parxomenko, *Ukrajins'ka mova,* čast' 1, Kyjiv, 1961. pp. 97 - 103.

A fairly clear view on the phonemic and phonetic features of the Ukrainian consonants under discussion were expressed by G. Shevelov (=Šerex). He said that

> "palatalization of labials *p b f v m* has no independent meaning and usually occurs when these consonants are followed by the front vowel *i*. This is an adaptation of the pronunciation of these consonants to the following *i*. However, this *softness* (undl. W.J.) caused by the vowel *i* cannot be replaced by *hardness* (undl. W.J.) and, on the other side, all these consonants are hard in the position before other vowels and at the end of a word and a syllable. Thus, from the standpoint of their phonemic contrast these shades of hardness and softness are meaningless."[13]

This view is correct. One should bear in mind that this softening of the labial is very slight. It is the same or even less than the softening of the dental consonants /t d l n/ before /i/ (< o, e). For example, /v/ and /b/ in the words /viz/ (< vozъ) and /bik/ (< bokъ) are not softer than /n/ and /t/ in the words /nis/ (< nosъ) and /stil/ (< stolъ). Further on Shevelov says:

> "Remains of the older status when labials had phonemic softening have been partly preserved in a few words where *v* and *m* became palatalized before vowels *a, o*. These words are: *свято* (svjato= holyday), *цвях* (cvjax= nail), *тьмяний* (t'mjanyj=dusky), *духмяний* (duxmjanyj=fragrant), *різдвяний* (rizdvjanyj=Christmas, attr.), *горохвяний* (horoxvjanyj=pea, attr.), *цвйохнути* (cvjoxnuty=whip, lash), *лижвяний* (lyžvjanyj=ski, attr.), *жвяхтіти* (zvjaxtity=to dabble), *дзвякати* (dzvjakaty=to tinkle), *морквяний* (morkvjanyj= carrot, attr.), *мертвяк* (mertvjak= corpse), *червяк* (červjak=worm). These words most frequently are pronounced *s'v'ato, c'v'ax,* etc. where softness of the labial has distinguishing (i.e., phonemic, W.J.) feature, e.g., *svat* 'match-maker' and *svjat* 'of the holydays'. However, these are just non-characteristic remainders and they already oftentimes are pronounced *červjak, c'vjoxnuty* with hardened (dispalatalized) labial and the following it *j*, as it is in the

[13] Jurij Šerex, *Kurs sučasnoji ukrajins'koji literaturnoji movy*, Munich, 1951, pp. 376 - 377.

words *м'ясо* (mjaso=meat), *в'язка* (vjazka=truss), *мавпячий* (mavpjačyj=monkeyish)."[14]

Here one may have some reservation. It appears that *m'* and *v'* in the words cited (and their number is limited) are independent palatalized phonemes because they possess a qualitative distinguishing function. On the other hand, they often lose that function because they become hard (dispalatalized). The phonemic juxtaposition appears unconvincing. Only one word of the above group may be phonemically analyzed, namely, *svjat* /s'v'at/ contrasting with *svat* /svat/. The rest of them have no such contrasting features, e.g., there is no *cvax, morkvanyj, červak,* etc.

According to the traditional way of explaining the quality of the labial in the word *svjato* (and its derivatives) *v'* in these words retained its softness even after its dispalatalization due to the preceding consonant *s'* which under the influence of the previously soft *v'* also became soft and by its softness influenced *v* even after complete dispalatalization of the labial consonants in Ukrainian.

It is true that dental consonants in contradistinction to velars in the East Slavic languages had contrastive pairs of non-palatalized:palatalized phonemes, the results of the second and third palatalization and, later on, the results of full palatalization of semi-soft consonants in position before front vowels. It is true that they could become palatalized under the influence of the following palatalized consonant usually followed by

[14] Ibidem, p. 377. The words *mjaso* and *vjazka* are also listed in their orthographic form with apostrophe after *m* and *v: м'ясо, в'язка,* but *mavpjačyj* without apostrophe: *мавпячий.* The apostrophe after orthographic labial consonants before *я, ю, є, ї,* indicates that these consonants in modern Ukrainian are non-palatalized.

[15] After the etymological /i/ and /y/ had fused in mid /y/, the velar consonants began to function as non-palatalized phonemes /k h (g) x/, occurring only as slightly softened combinatory allophones before *i* (< o, e). Even palatalized labial consonants before their dispalatalization could not change those non-palatalized velar phonemes to palatalized phonemes; they could only impart some slight softness. All the more must the possibility of such a change be excluded after labials had been dispalatalized. As for /ž/ it also appears as non-palatalized phoneme; only rarely it is found soft /z'/, e.g., in *Nadvolž'a.*

the sound ['a] (from the nasal *e*), but later on in the process of dispalatalization of [v'] a split of one articulation of that sound took place, in connection with which two separate sounds arose: non-palatalized [v] and palatal [j]. In other words, [v] in the word *svjat* became a new non-palatalized phoneme /v/, while the preceding /s'/ retained its softness. Thus the phonemic contrast between the words /s'vjat/ - /svat/ is shown by /s' - s/, and by the presence of /j/ in the first word and its absence in the second word, not by /v - v'/. There is no palatalized /v'/ in this word (or its derivatives). The same may be said of the words *rizdvjanyj, dzvjakaty, t'mjanyj, cvjax, červjak* and *mertvjak* in which /v m/ are preceded by consonants belonging to the same group as /s'/ (cf. /d' t' c' ʒ' r'/. (Note: *ʒ* presents orthographic *dz*). In the remaining words of the group, i.e., *duxmjanyj, horoxvjanyj, morkvjanyj, lyžvjanyj* and *žvjaxtity* /v m/ also are non-palatalized and consonants preceding them are allophones of the non-palatalized /x k ž/; the first two have no contrastive phonemes /x' k'/ and cannot support softness of the [v], and /ž/ appears almost exclusively as a non-palatalized phoneme.

[16] a. No wonder that B. Hrinčenko in his dictionary (*Slovar ukrajins'koji movy,* Kyjiv, 1909) used an apostrophe after *v* in some words of the second group to indicate "hardness" of that labial. For example, one finds there the following words and their spelling: *мертв'як* (mertvjak), *мертв'яцький* (mertvjac'kyj), *моркв'яний* (morkvjanyj), *тьм'яний* (t'mjanyj), *тьм'яно* (t'mjano), *цв'ягнути* (cvjahnuty=to whip), *цьв'якати* (c'vjakaty=to hew), and for the word *свят* (svjat) the following remark: in literature this word and its derivatives are usually written without an apostrophe, — it is pronounced this way by the Ukrainian intelligentia, but popular pronunciation is different. The people pronounce [svjatyj], and [s'vatyj], and [svetyj] and [s'atyj]. This question has not been investigated sufficiently... We retain here the spelling of this word without apostrophe, but we do not consider this problem solved."

b. The use of the apostrophe after labial consonants before *я, ю, є, ї* in all these words would simplify learning the phonetic and phonemic system of the Ukrainian language by students in both Ukrainian and non-Ukrainian schools.

c. Here belong French, German and other loan-words in which apostrophe is not used after labial before *я* (ja), *ю* (ju), *є* (je); this in order to convey a softened pronunciation of the labial in these words in their original languages. In other words, they have not been naturalized within the Ukrainian orthoepy. Reservation would be made regarding the word *бязь* (bjaz'=coarse calico) which is sometimes written with an apostrophe, sometimes without it. It is a Turkish loan-word (from Arabic), and the author of this paper was unable to investigate the sound features of the consonant *б* from its phonetic and phonemic standpoint.

This analysis is also supported by the fact that in Ukrainian the palatalized labial consonants never appear at a word-boundary, a position most characteristic for showing the phonemic contrast of non-palatalized:palatalized consonants. Cf. /kin - kin′/ (stake -horse), /kil -kil′/ (pale - keel), /pil - pil′/ (plank-bed - of the fields), /vist - vis′t′/ (whist - news) and others.

Thus, all labial consonants in modern Ukrainian are non-palatalized phonemes, and they have no palatalized counterparts. They can appear before /a u y e i/, /ja - ju - je - ji/, and as slightly softened combinatory allophones before /i/ and /j/.

According to contemporary Ukrainian orthography writing consonant + *я, ю, є, ї,* without apostrophe after the consonant, one indicates that such combination presents palatalized consonant phoneme + noniotacized vowel; by writing *б, п, в, ф, м* and sometimes *з* with apostrophe and iotacized vowel we indicate that these letters stand for non-palatalized consonant phonemes followed by iotacized vowels. For example, in the words *любов* /l′ubov/ (love), *нюх* /n′ux/ (scent), *зять* /z′at′/ (son-in-law), *сюди* /s′udy/ (here) the letters *л, н, з, с* stand for palatalized phonemes /l′ n′ z′ s′/ which are followed by noniotacized vowels /u/ or /a/, or, to be more exact, by their allophones. But in the words such as *б'ють* /bjut′/ (they beat), *в'юн* /vjun/ (loach), *в'язень* /vjazen′/ (prisoner), *м'ясо* /mjaso/ (meat), etc. there are separate non-palatalized /b v m/, palatal /j/ and /u/ or /a/. Hence the spelling of the words *свят* (svjat), *різдвяний* (rizdvjanyj), *морквяний* (morkvjanyj), *червяк* (červjak), *тьмяний* (t′mjanyj), *мавпячий* (mavpjačyj) etc. with the combination of *вя* (vja), *мя* (vja), *пя* (pja) without apostrophe after *в, м, п,* (to indicate that these consonants are non-palatalized) does not reflect their phonemic status in the phonological system of contemporary Ukrainian and violates logical consistency in their orthographic usage. They are shown here as independent palatalized phonemes /v′ m′ p′/ contrasting with non-palatalized /v m p/ (the latter appearing, e.g., in words such as *в'язати* (vjazaty=to bind), *в'ялий* (vjalyj=flabby), *м'ясо* (mjaso=meat), etc. Making exception for these words in modern Ukrainian is not justifiable. The apostrophe should be used in all Ukrainian words with combinations consisting of a

labial + *я* (ja), *ю* (ju), *ї* (ji), *є* (je) regardless of whether such a combination is or is not preceded by any other consonant. Therefore, one should write not only *в'ялий, в'язень, м'ясо, п'явка* (=leech) but also *св'ято, різдв'яний, моркв'яний, черв'як, тьм'яний, духм'яний, мавп'ячий,* etc.

In contrast to Ukrainian, Russian has paired non-palatalized: palatalized labials, that is, /p - p'/, /b - b'/, /f - f'/, /v - v'/ and /m - m'/, contrary to Kovaliv's statement that in Russian, like in Ukrainian, there are only non-palatalized labials. In words such as *губя* (gubja= ruining), *дымя* (dymja=smoking), *живя* (žyvja=living), *графя* (grafja= ruling), *спят* (spjat=they sleep) (given by Kovaliv as examples) "the impression of palatalness, - he says, - is produced by that additional articulation of the iotacized element of the following vowel, symbolized by the letter *я* (ja). *These consonants cannot be considered separate phonemes* (undl. W.J.). Here the essential phonemic role is played by the iotacism of the following vowel *я* (ja), which affects changing of the meaning of the word (guba - gubja, žyva - žyvja)."[17]

We must qualify, this interpretation is incorrect. The letter *я* in these and other similar Russian words does not symbolize a combination of *й+а* (j+a), but a palatalness of the preceding consonant and the allophone [a]. It is always so, in all cases, when a consonant is followed by the letter *я* (ja), *ю* (je), *е* (je), *ё* (jo), i.e., when between them there is no separating sign ъ or ь. In other words, the combinations spelled *бя* (bja), *мя* (mja), *вя* (vja), *пя* (pja) do not represent three phonemes, as Kovaliv maintains, but two: /б'а/ (/b'a/), /в'а/ (/v'a/), м'а/ (/m'a/), /ф'а/ (/f'a/), /п'а/ (/p'a/). The iotacized element Kovaliv describes does not belong to [a] and is not present here, its having become fused with the preceding labial consonant; as a result a palatalized consonantal phoneme arose contrastive to non-palatalized. In the words *вал* (val= billow, rampart) -*вял* (v'al=faded), *губа* (guba=lip) -*губя* (gub'a=ruining), *дыма* (dyma=of the smoke) -*дымя* (dym'a=smoking), etc., a distinction as to meaning is signaled by the contrast of /v - v'/, /b - b'/,

[17] P. Kovaliv, op. cit., p. 242.

/m - m′/, and not by [a - ja]. Both non-palatalized and palatalized labial consonants can appear before all non-front vowels and before /i/, the latter being replaced by the allophone [v] after non-palatalized labial; in the position before /e/ only palatalized labial can appear.

Palatalized labial before /u/ appears rarely, mainly in words of foreign origin, e.g., *бюст* /b′ust/ (bust), *бюджет* /b′uǯet/ (=budget), *пюре* /p′ure/ (=pure[l]e), *фюзеляж* /f′uzel′až/ (fuselage) and some others.

As for the existence of non-palatalized:palatalized labial consonants in modern Russian there is no disagreement among scholars who base their opinion on the physiological-acoustic and phonemic quality of these consonants. Thus Avanesov, main authority in the field of Russian phonology, remarks:

> "With regard to soft consonants before vowels [a], [o], [u] one should pay special attention to the pronunciation of the words such as *мясо* (meat), *мягкий* (soft), *пятый* (fifth), *завял* (faded), *привязан* (tied), *ребята* (children), *бюст* (bust), *пюре* (purée), *вёл* (vël=he led); they should be pronounced [m′a]so, [m′ax]kij, [p′a]tyj, za[v′a]l, pri[v′a]zan, re[b′a]ta, [b′u]st, [p′u]re, [v′o]l... This standard in Russian often is violated by those born in Ukraine and Belorussia.[18] Instead of the soft labial consonant + [a], [u] or [o] they often pronounce labial consonant + j + vowel [a], [u] or [o]: i[mja], [mja]so, [mja]xkij, [pja]tyj, [vja]lyj, re[bja]ta. With this kind of pronunciation the additional articulation of the softness does not accompany the basic articulation of the labial consonant; instead it sets apart from this basic articulation a separate articulation which comes *after* the articulation of the labial consonant. Therefore, in order to master the articulation of a soft labial before [a], [u], [o] it is necessary at the very beginning of pronunciation of the labial to raise the middle part of the tongue as high as we do when we pronounce [i] or [j]. Otherwise written syllables such as *пё бё* and *пьё бьё, пя бя* and *пья бья, пю бю* and *пью бью* would be pronounced the same way, i.e., with the sound [j], e.g., *пьёт* (he drinks) and *Пётр* (Peter) would sound [pjo]t and [pjo]tr.

[18] See Note 30b.

[19] R.I. Avanesov, *Russkoe literaturnoe proiznošenie,* Moskva, 1956, pp. 143 - 144, (trsl. by W.J.).

The existence of the phonemic pairedness of non-palatalized: palatalized labial consonants in Russian has been endorsed by most scholars, including Shevelov,[20] Unbegaun,[21] Gvozdëv,[22] Finkel′, Bаženov,[23] Galkina-Fedoruk, Gorškova, Šanskij,[24] Zemskij, Krjučkov Svetlaev,[25] Valgina, Rosental′, Fomina, Capukevič,[26] ANSSSR,[27] and others.

After the reduced vowel ь was dropped in weak position in East Slavic languages, in Russian only the labial [m] at the end of a word lost its soft quality,[28] the rest of the labial consonants preserving their softness, becoming independent phonemes. As to their phonemicity, they can appear in the position which is the best indicator of the phonemic feature of any soft consonant, not only in Russian but also in the other Slavic languages, and in such position they can be contrasted with their hard partners; such a position is immediately before they word-boundary. This feature does not exist in Ukrainian (see previous paragraphs). Cf. Russian /brat/ (brother) — /brat′/ (to take), /v′es/ (weight) — /v′es" (all).

[20] George Y. Shevelov, *Prehistory of Slavic*, New York: Columbia University Press, 1956, p. 635.

[21] B.O. Unbegaun, *Russian Grammar*, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1957, p. 8.

[22] A.N. Gvozdëv, *Sovremennyj russkij literaturnyj jazyk*, I, Moskva, 1967, pp. 16, 19, 21, 24.

[23] A.M. Finkel′ and N. Baženov, *Kurs sovremennogo russkogo literaturnogo jazyka*, Kiev, pp. 178 - 179.

[24] E.M. Galkina-Fedoruk, K.V. Gorškova, N.M. Šanskij, *Sovremennyj russkij jazyk*, Moskva, 1958, pp. 120, 123 - 124, 128.

[25] A.M. Zemskij, S.E. Krjučkov, M.V. Svetlaev, *Russkij jazyk*, I, Moskva, 1955, p. 91.

[26] N.S. Valgina, D.E. Rosental′, M.N. Fomina, V.V. Capukevič, *Sovremennyj russkij jazyk*, Moskva, 1961, pp. 82 - 83.

[27] ANSSSR, *Grammatika russkogo jazyka*, Moskva, 1960, pp. 62 - 63, 66 - 67.

[28] In literary monuments this phenomenon seldom appeared in the 13th century and it was not noticeably reflected in the monuments of the following centuries either. Softness has remained only in few words such as *семь* /s′em′/ (seven), *восемь* /vos′em′/ (eight), *темь* /t′em′/ (dark), *наземь* /naz′em′/ (down) — in the first two words possibly under the influence of the forms of the oblique cases in which *m* is soft (cf.s′e[m′i], vos[m′i], or under the influence of the numerals *пять* /p′at′/ (five), *шесть* /ses′t′/ (six), *девять* /d′ev′at/ (nine) (since all of them belong to the same grammatical category). The words /t′em′/ and /naz′em′/ are solely colloqwial and not standard literary.

Words such as *цеп* /cep/ (flail) and *цепь* /cep'/ (chain), *mon* /top/ (footfall) and *mопь* /top'/ (swamp), *глуп* /glup/ (stupid) and *глубь* /glup'/ (depth) are distinguished only by the non-palatalized and palatalized labial consonant at the word desinance and not by the *j* element combined with the following vowel, because phonemically the combination does not exist. Here the contrast of non-palatalized:palatalized at the end of these words serves as the only means for distinguishing the phonemic shape of these words and, along with this, their meaning. Such a distinction cannot be made by combinatory allophones,[29] a fact refuting the statement of those who assert that Russian soft labial consonants cannot be considered separate phonemes and that in the words *губа* /guba/ — *губя* /gub'a/, *жива* /žyva/ — *живя* /žyv'a/, etc. the basic phonemic role is performed by iotacization of the following vowel *(йа)* as it is in Ukrainian. Such a statement has no justifiable linguistic basis.

In contemporary standard Belorussian one also finds a system of paired non-palatalized:palatalized labials /b - b'/, /p - p'/, /v - v'/, /f -f'/, /m - m'/. Non-palatalized labials can appear before /i o u a/, /i/ being replaced by allophone [y]; their palatalized counterparts can appear before /i e o a/. Examples: /p'il/ (dust), /vóči/ (eyes), /funt/ (pound), /váb'ic'/ (attract), /p'is'mó/ (letter), /v'érna/ (right), /v'óska/ (village), /af'ára/ (sacrifice).[30]

Labials /b' p' v' f' m'/ before /u/ appear rarely, mainly in loanwords, e.g., *бюро́* /b'uro/ (bureau), *пюре́* /p'ure/ (purée). The phonemic contrast of the non-palatalized:palatalized labials can take place

[29] In such a position, e.g., there are no velar /k' g' x'/. Therefore, although they can appear before /i/ and /e/, scholars consider them to be allophones of non-palatalized /k g x/, not as separate phonemes. (I. Ivanov, *Kratkij očerk istoričeskoj fonetiki russkogo jazyka,* Moskva, 1959, p. 113; R.N. Avanesov, *Fonetika sovremennogo russkogo jazyka,* Moskva, 1956, p. 170.

[30] a. Labial consonants became non-palatalized before /i/ in the dialects of over ten regions on the territory bordering Poland on the south-west and on Ukraine in the south. Non-palatalization of the labials before /e/ has been recorded in the same dialects and in many other on the broader territory of the same geographical zone. Non-palatalization of the labials before /a/ (< ę) and /o/ has been recorded even on broader territory than their non-palatalization before /e/. In distinction from the non-palatalization of the labials

before all vowels except for /e/ and /u/; non-palatalized labials before /e/ are automatically replaced by their palatalized counterparts and before /u/ they appear almost exclusively as non-palatalized.

The function of the labial consonants before /e/ in Belorussian and the possibility of their appearance as non-palatalized and palatalized before /i o a/ is phonemically identical to the function of the labials in Russian, distinguishing them entirely from the phonemic function of these consonants in Ukrainian. As for the exclusive use of non-palatalized labials before /u/ in Belorussian, one finds a full similarity to Russian; in both languages the palatalized labial before /u/ usually occurs in loan-words. Unlike Russian, in standard Belorussian in all its dialects there are no pair non-palatalized:palatalized labials in their most distinguishable position, namely, at the end of the word. In that position, as in Ukrainian, only non-palatalized labials appear. Cf. Belorussian *голуб* /holup/ (pigeon), *сем* /s'em/ (seven), *насып* /nasyp/ (dam); Ukrainian *голуб* /holub/, *сім* /s'im/, *насип* /nasyp/; Russian *голубь* /golup'/, *семь* /s'em'/, *насыпь* /nasip'/.

This phonemic description is based on the works of Lomtev,[31] Hurski, Bulaxaŭ and Marčanka,[32] and Padlužny.[33]

before /i e/ where etymological palatalized labial simply become non-palatalized, the non-palatalization before /a o/ is accompanied by separating *j* after these liabals, e.g., *мяса* /mjasa/, *пяць* /pjac'/. This is found in almost all the dialects in the Berest district and in some dialects of the Minsk district. Palatalized labials before /a/ (< ę) have also been recorded there. This information has been taken from N.V. Biryla's article "Etymolohična mjakkija hubnyja zyčnaja ŭ beraruskix narodnyx hovorkax" in: *Pracy Instytuta movoznavstva,* AN BSSR, Minsk, 1957, pp. 75 - 93. Biryla wrote his article on the basis of the materials from 1130 inhabited places of Belorussia.

b. Speaking of the people born in Belorussia who pronounce Russian words with soft labial sound and the following [·a] as a combination of labial + [j] + [·a], Avanesov most likely had in mind the people from the territory where the labial consonants became non-palatalized and exhibited [j] as it was in Ukrainian. However, in standard Belorussian there is no *j* between a labial consonant and the vowel.

[31] T.P. Lomtev, *Grammatika belorusskogo jazyka,* Moskva, 1956, pp. 44 - 45, 47 - 48, 50.

[32] N.I. Hurski, M.H. Bulaxaŭ, M.C. Marčanka, *Belaruskaja mova,* Minsk, 1958, p. 74.

[33] A.I. Padlužny, *Fanalahičnaja sistema belaruskaj literaturnaj movy,* Minsk, 1969, pp. 53, 100, 130.

Conclusions.

In modern standard Ukrainian one finds only non-palatalized labial consonants /b p v f m/; these consonants have no phonemically palatalized partners. This phenomenon embraces all words in which labial consonants appear before any front vowel or non-front vowel, with a preceding *j* or without it, and includes not only words in which there is no other consonant preceding the labial consonant but also those in which such a preceding consonant exists, e.g., *в'янути* /vjanuty/ (fade), *м'ясо* /mjaso/, *св'ятий* /s'vjatyj/, *мертв'як* /mertvjak/, etc. In these words only softened allophones of the non-palatalized labials appear, not their contrastive palatalized partners. They have the same phonemic quality before /i/, e.g., *бік* /bik/ (side), *вік* /vik/ (age), *фізик* /fizyk/ (physician), *півень* /piven'/ (cock), *міра* /mira/ (measure), etc. This is one of the characteristic features of modern standard Ukrainian, distinguishing it from the two other East Slavic languages, Russian and Belorussian.

Paired non-palatalized:palatalized labial consonant phonemes before all vowels with the exception of /e/ (before which all consonants are palatalized) and /u/ (before it palatalized consonants occur almost exclusively in foreign loan-words), and their occurrence in a non-palatalized:palatalized contrast in the most distinguishing phonemic position, i.e., word final position, is one of the characteristic features of modern standard Russian, distinguishing it from two other East Slavic languages, i.e., Ukrainian and Belorussian.

The Belorussian phonemic contrast of labial consonants before all vowels except for /e/ and the absence of such contrast at the end of words, which is the most distinguishing position for non-palatalized and palatalized consonants, partly resembles Ukrainian, but maintains a dominant similarity to the phonemic features of the Russian language. In standard Belorussian this phenomenon occupies a transitional place, if one does not take into consideration non-palatalized labials before /i e o a/ (a < ę) and the absence of contrastive palatalization in this position in many dialects on the south-west territory of Belorussia bordering on Poland and on the southern territory bordering on Ukraine. It should be noted that the non-palatalization of the labial consonants

before /o/ and /a/ (< ę) in these dialects is accompanied, but not consistently, by distinguishing *j* labials, as in Ukrainian.

Nouns in -u in the Genitive Singular in Modern East Slavic Languages

1.0 HISTORICAL ASPECT

1.1 Nouns with the old stem *u in all Slavic languages in their prehistoric and early historic period lost their own declension. Some of their inflectional endings replaced the endings of masculine nouns with stem in *o and *jo. Such an ending which persists till the present day in the Slavic languages, in some of them quite extensively, is the masculine genitive singular ending -u.

There were not many u-stem nouns in Old Church Slavic: *čin* 'rank', *darъ* 'gift', *dlъgъ* 'debt', *dolъ* 'pit', *domъ* 'house', *dǫbъ* 'oak', *glasъ* 'voice', *grъmъ* 'bush', *kratъ* 'time', *medъ* 'honey', *mirъ* 'world', *nizъ* 'bottom, lower part', *polъ* 'half', *rędъ* 'row', *rodъ* 'race', *sanъ* 'rank', *stanъ* 'camp', *synъ* 'son', *volъ* 'ox', *vrъxъ* 'top, *sъnъ* 'sleep', *jadъ* 'poison'.[1] In the Kievan Rus' literary monuments their number is considerably larger, including nouns denoting substances, collective objects, places (after prepositions) and abstract notions.[2] In contemporary standard Ukrain-

[1] These nouns also could have the ending -u in the locative singular which was always stressed, in distinction to the unstressed -u in the ginitive singular. These nouns could also have the ending -a or -ě in the genitive singular. A.A. Šaxmatov, *Istoričeskaja morfologija russkogo jazyka,* Moskva, 1957, p. 83.

[2] A.A. Šaxmatov, op. cit., p. 241-244.

ian there are approximately 3,050 such nouns, about 250 more than in Belorussian, and about nineteen times as many as in modern Russian.

The cause of the expansion of these nouns in all the Slavic languages, especially in Ukrainian, and their contemporary status has not been thoroughly investigated. Some comments in that area were made by Šaxmatov, Bulaxovs'kyj, and Obnorskij. Šaxmatov considered semantics the main factor in the usage of the ending -u in the genitive singular in the inflectional system of masculine nouns: most nouns with the stem in *u denoted inanimate objects, he said; therefore, the ending -u spread to those nouns which denoted substances, abstract notions etc., that is, inanimate objects. However, there were only two nouns with the stem in *u, he said, which denoted animate nouns, namely, *synъ* and *volъ,* and they fell under the influence of the nouns with the stem in *o.[3] Likewise Bulaxovs'kyj thought that semantics was the main cause of the usage of the ending -u for nouns with stem in *o.[4] According to Obnorskij, stress was the main factor in that process. At the initial stage of that process, he said, in the group of nouns with stem in *u there were only words with a mobile stress: in the genitive singular it fell on the stem, and in the locative on the ending -u, which meant that in the process was a regularity, not a casual usage.[5] The opinion of these three scholars seems convincing. Most probably semantic factors combined with stress played the most important role at the initial stage of that process. However, in further development of the East Slavic literary languages Church Slavic also played a significant role. In the manuscripts of this language, as has been noted, only twenty-two nouns are attested with the ending -u in the genitive singular (alongside the normal ending -a), the rest of the nouns having the ending -a in this case. Church Slavic had a great influence on the development of the Russian literary language; its prevailing genitive singular ending -a obstructed, so to speak, the entering of the forms with the ending -u, the

[3] Ibidem.

[4] L.A. Bulaxovs'kyj, *Istoričeskij komentarij k russkomu literaturnomu jazyku,* izd. 3, Kiev, 1950, pp. 115-116.

[5] S.P. Obnorskij, *Imennoe sklonenie v sovremonnom russkom jazyke,* vol. 1, 1927, p. 166.

latter being characteristic of the vernacular. The influence of Church Slavic and the long-lasting conservatism of the Russian literary language finds issue in the fact that in modern Russian there is a very small number of masculine nouns with the ending -u in the genitive singular. The Ukrainian language freed itself from the influence of Church Slavic already by the middle of the 18th century and absorbed a broad stream of vernacular, including numerous instances of masculine nouns with the ending -u in the genitive singular. Most likely a similar process occurred in Belorussian as well.

The purpose of this paper is to examine the approximate body of masculine nouns with the ending -u in the genitive singular in modern Ukrainian, Belorussian, and Russian; their structure, lexical-semantic similarities and differences, and the current status and tendencies in their usage.

2.0 CORPUS OF THE NOUNS DISCUSSED AND THEIR LEXICAL-SEMANTIC PROPERTIES

2.1 The corpus of the material in this paper was taken from the following sources: Zenon Kuzelja and Jaroslav Rudnyc'kyj, *Ukrajins'ko-nimec'kyj slovnyk,* 8-ed., New York, 1955; K.K. Krapiva, *Belaruska-ruski sloŭnik,* Minsk: AN USSR, 1962; S.I. Ožegov, *Slovar' russkogo jazyka,* 4th ed., Moskva, 1960; R.I. Avanesov and S.I. Ožegov, *Russkoe literaturnoe proiznošenie i udarenie,* Moskva: Gos. izd. inostr. i nacion. slovarej, 1959; N. Davydov, *Botaničeskij slovar',* Moskva, 1960.

In this paper the following abbreviations for these sources are used: K&R=Kuzelja and Rudnyc'kyj's dictionary, H=Holoskevyč's dictionary, also U=Ukrainian dictionaries for both; Krap=Krapiva's dictionary, also B=Belorussian dictionary; Ozg=Ozegov's dictionary; Avn=Avanesov's dictionary, also R=Russian dictionaries for both. Other abbreviations: Nsg=nominative singular; Gsg=genitive singular; Lsg=locative singular; dim.=diminutive; aff.=affectionate; symbol ʒ̆=phoneme represented by the letters *dž* (in spelling) and symbol ʒ=phoneme represented by the letter *dz* (in spelling); sp=spelled.

Consulted were: *Slovnyk ukrajins'koji movy,* 11 vls, Kyjiv: AN

USSR, 1970-1981; V.S. Il'jin, K.P. Dorošenko, S.P. Levčenko and others, *Ukrajins'ko-Rosijs'kyj slovnyk,* Kyjiv: "Naukova dumka", 1965; J.B. Rudnyc'kyj and K. Cerkevyč, *Pravopysnyj slovnyk ukrajins'koji movy,* New York, 1979; M.L. Podvez'ko, *Ukrajins'ko-Anhlijs'kyj slovnyk,* 1954; *Leksyčnyj fond literaturnoji movy kyjivs'koho periodu X-XIV st.,* New York; NTSh, 1962.

All material in this paper is cited in phonemic transcription.

2.2 In K&R there are about 72,000 entries, including deriving, derivative and cognate forms,[6] Ožg gives 53,000 words, and Krap contains 90,000 words, although most derivatives in it are listed as separate items and not under the basic deriving words (thus its corpus of 90,000 does not mean that Belorussian has 35,000 more words than Ukrainian and Russian). In addition, the Ukrainian and the Russian dictionaries contain a very limited number of special terms, especially in the fields of science, such as chemistry, pharmacy, medicine, botany and so on, which constitute a considerable portion of the word-corpus of Krap. Most of these terms in U and B dictionaries are masculine nouns with the Gsg ending -u, hence the difference between the total corpus of the entries in these two dictionaries. In Russian this matter is not an issue because in Russian all such nouns take the ending -a in the Gsg; the ending -u exists only as a doublet for some of them, limited severely as to context (see 5.3).

2.3 In the Ukrainian dictionaries (K&R and H) there are about 73 terms denoting chemical elements and compounds, and in B dictionary (Krap) about 215. However, their lack in the U dictionaries does not mean that they are lacking in Ukrainian; the overwhelming majority are part of international terminology and as such are used in most modern developed languages. In the above U dictionaries, e.g., there are no terms corresponding to B's as *bárij, aleín, al'kahal'át, al'umìnát, al'deh'íd, aman'ít,* but some of them are listed in other U dictionaries, e.g., in *Ukrainian-English Dictionary* by Podvez'ko, and they are surely listed

[6] The authors of this dictionary do not give the total number of words listed in it. I multiplied the total number of pages, i.e., 1494, by the average number of the basic (key) words of one page and received the approximate total of 54,000 of the first (basic) words.

in special technological dictionaries which, unfortunately, have not been available to the author. Taking this factor into consideration, one may say that in Ukrainian and Russian the number of such terms is not less than in Belorussian.

2.4 In B there are about 180 botanic terms with the ending -u in the Gsg, while in U there are only those which are used most often, numbering 75. Here again many nouns are not included which are in B and R, such as: adón'is, amaryl'is (R amaryll'is), améžnik (R sp omež-nik), babóŭn'ik (R sp bobovnik), etc.[7] These words are used in Ukrainian, and most of them have the Gsg ending -u.

2.5 Another group of nouns of the same declension with the quantitavie differentiation in dictionaries are abstract nouns in -izm, -yzm,[8] denoting social-political systems, state organizations, scientific, public, political and literary movements, doctrines and trends, various attributive tendencies and some notions with a concrete meaning. Examples in Ukrainian: *absol'utýzm, monarxízm, komun'ízm, symvol'ízm, bandytýzm, idiotýzm* and others. In U dictionaries there are about 120 while B lists about 250 such nouns. However, in Ukrainian all have the ending -u in the Gsg, wheras in Belorussian some take the ending -a. Keeping this in mind, one feels certain that in Ukrainian such nouns exceed 250, but that many of them corresponding to nouns in Belorussians are not included in K&R and H dictionaries; e.g., not included are such words as *klerykal'ízm, dramatýzm, drujidýzm, dydaktýzm, diamagnetýzm* and numerous others.

2.6 In Ukrainian, the number of abstract nouns, other than those in -izm, -yzm with the Gsg ending -u considerably surpass the number of such nouns in Russian and Belorussian. In this group two subgroups can be distinguished: a) suffixless nouns formed from prefixed verbs and b) all other abstract nouns, that is, both prefixal-suffixal and prefixless-suffixal. In the first subgroup there are about 600 nouns, and

[7] Unfortunately, a Ukrainian dictionary of botanic terms is not available to me, hence I cannot give Ukrainian botanical terms corresponding to such terms in Belorussian or Russian.

[8] In Russian all the nouns of this group take the ending -a in the Gsg.

in the second about 900, while in B the first subgroup includes about 400 nouns and the second about 750. Here belong such nouns as *dodátok* 'addition' (B dadátak), *doktorát* 'doctorate' (B daktaràt), *dysonáns* 'dissonance' (B disanáns), etc.

Among the abstract nouns there are numerous medical terms besides those ending in -izm, e.g., *dyfterýt* 'diphteria', (B difterít), *nevrýt* 'neuritis' (B nefrít), *men'ingít* 'meningitis' (B mén'ingít) and others. In Krap dictionary such terms overwhelm quantitatively the terms in K&R and H dictionaries in the proportion of 75 to 35. This is explained by the fact that in the U dictionaries many medical terms are not listed and that some B terms in that group have corresponding U terms of the feminine gender, e.g., B *ps'ixanevrós* 'psychoneurosis', -U *psyxonevróza.* In Russian all of them have the ending -a in the Gsg.

2.7 Besides concrete nouns denoting botanic, chemical, pharmaceutical, mineralogical, geological, textile and culinary terms in Ukrainian there is also a group of concrete nouns which do not belong to any of this group, e.g., *avtošl'áx* 'highway', *al'manáx* 'almanac', *aparát* 'apparatus', *arxív* 'archives', *arxipel'áh* 'archipelago', *átlas* 'atlas', and others. About 430 of them are listed in U dictionaries, in B dictionary about 200 fewer. In R dictionaries, regardless of their number, they take the ending -a, along with which the ending -u can also be used, but with some limitations (see 5.3). In general, nouns of this group may denote: a) natural phenomena, e.g., U *víter* (wind) *-tru* (B *v'éc'er -tru*), U *vohón'* (fire) *-hn'ú* (B *ahón' -hn'ú*), U *moróz* (frost) *-u* (B *marós -rózu*), U *s'n'ih* (snow) *-u* (B *s'n'ex -s'n'éhu*), U *došč* (rain) *-ú* (B *došč -daždžú*); b) substances and material, e.g., U *pisók* (sand) *-skú* (B *p'asók -skú*), U *čaj* (tea) *-u* (B *čaj -u*), U *horóx* (pea) *-u*[9] (B *haróx -u*); c) various feelings, e.g., U *bil'* (pain) *-ból'u* (B *bol' -u*), U *žax* (horror) *-u* (B *žax -u*), U *smútok* (sorrow) *-tku* (B *smu[1]tak -tku*); d) intellectual notions, various statuses, e.g., U *húmor* (humor) *-u* (B *húmar -u*), U *spókij* (peace) *-kóju* (B *spakój -u*); e) institutions, organizations, e.g., U *universytét* (univer-

[9] It is sometimes impossible to determine which of the nouns takes the ending -u and which takes the ending -a; cf. *horóx-u* (collective noun), *jačmín' - jačmén'u* (coll. noun), but *ovés* 'oat', belonging to the same lexical-semantic category, has the ending -a in the Gsg, i.e., *vivsá* and not *vivsú.*

sity) *-u, instytút* (institute) *-u, arxív* (archives) *-u, mahazýn* (store) *-u;* but in B (Gsg. *un'iv'ers'it'ét-a, arx'ív-a, mahaz'ín-a* etc.) as in Russian.

2.8 One also should note the group of collective nouns, represented by, e.g., U *verbolíz* (willow-bush) *-lózu* (B *v'erbalós -lózu*), U *vynohrád* (grapes) *-u* (B *v'inahrád -u*), U *klyr* (clergy) *-u* (B *kl'ir -u*), U *l'ud* (folks) *-u* (B *l'ut -l'ud-u*) and others. About 70 nouns of this group are listed in the dictionaries of both languages.

2.9 Attention should also be given to nouns denoting names of cities and towns, rivers, islands, mountains, etc., especially foreign names which take the ending -u in the Gsg in Ukrainian and Belorussian but in Russian, which has only the ending -a. In the K&R dictionary 52 such names are listed but there are many more. Examples: Berlín, M'únchen, Lóndon, Parýž, Rym, Stokhól'm, Washingtón, Tašként, Ródos, Urál, Don, Styr and others.

2.10 In modern Russian there are only 212 masculine nouns which may have the ending -u or -a in the Gsg (as to usage, see 5.3). Out of this number about 95 are abstract nouns, 76 nouns denoting substances, 32 are concrete nouns, several are collective and a few nouns denoting material.

2.11 In general, the quantitative relation of masculine nouns with the ending -u in the Gsg in modern standard East Slavic languages based on the above listed dictionaries, including undoubtedly existing but not included scientific terms in U, is this: in Ukrainian there are around 3,050 nouns, in Belorussian about 2,800 and in Russian 212. All the nouns in these three languages denote inanimate objects.[10]

3.0 STRUCTURE

3.1 In Ukrainian, the stems of these nouns can be monosyllabic, disyllabic and polysyllabic, e.g., *boršč* (beet-soup), *dótep* (joke), *vodo-*

[10] Since the number of masculine nouns denoting inanimate objects with the ending -a in the Gsg in modern Ukrainian reaches 2,200 and the number of those in -u is about 3,050, the ending -u not -a should be considered the main Gsg ending. In Belorussian the number of masculine nouns in -a is considerably larger than in Ukrainian; in Russian it exceeds the number of nouns in -u by 96%.

próvid (water-line), those with monosyllabic stems being most numerous. Stems can be hard or soft, hard stems being in the vast majority, possible final consonants being: *p, b, v, f, m, t, d, s, z, n, l. š, ž, č, šč, k, g* (very rare), *h, x.* Examples are: *krip* 'dill', *štab* 'group', *s'piv* 'singing', *štraf* 'fine', *šum* 'noise', *oborót* 'turn, revolution', *pójizd* 'train', *kurs* 'course', *moróz* 'frost', *poklín* 'bow, salute', *obvál* 'crumbling', *potáš* 'potas', *arbitráž* 'arbitrage', *došč* 'rain', *kryk* 'shout', *grog* 'grog', *bih* 'run, course', *rux* 'motion'. The appearing final soft stem consonants are: *l', n', c', j.* Examples include: *kys'íl'* 'kissel', *vohón'* 'fire', *ščyréc'* 'subsoil', *hnij* 'dung'. The vowel /u/ after these consonants is replaced by the allophone [-u].

Vowels /o e/ between consonants at word-boundary (i.e. in Nsg) are dropped when these consonants are followed by the vowel /u/ (i.e. in Gsg.), e.g. *mačók* 'corn poppy' *-mačkú;* but *mokréc'* 'chick-weed' *-mokrec'ú,* /e/ is not dropped because it is preceded by two consonants, not one. Exception is *derén* 'dog-berry' *-derenú* to distinguish it from *déren* 'turf, sod' *-dérnu.* Vowel /e/ preceded by a hard consonant and followed by a soft one at a word-boundary is dropped before /u/ at word-boundary, and the palatalized consonant before /u/ assimilates the preceding non-palatalized consonant, an exception being *r* plus labial consonant, e.g., *popiléc'* 'dim. ashes' *-popil'c'ú,* but *syrivéc'* 'bread-kvas' *-syrivc'ú, v* being labial is not assimilated to palatalized *c'.* The vowel /i/ between consonants at a word-boundary, except when the final consonant is *j,* alternates with /e/ between these two consonants followed by the vowel /u/ in the Gsg, e.g., *sverbíž* 'itching' *-bežú.* If the final consonant at the word-boundary is *j,* the vowel /i/ remains, e.g., *pyríj* 'twitch' *-pyrijú, ryžíj* 'false flax' *-ryžijú.*

3.2 Stress

3.2.1 About 55 nouns have stress on -u in the Gsg, stress falling in the rest on the stem (root-stem or affixal stem). Nouns with stress on -u in Gsg are: *bagáž* 'luggage', *barýš* 'profit, gain', *barxán* 'sandy hilllock', *berez'n'ák* 'birch-grove', *boršč* 'beet soup', *bur'ján* 'weeds', *vohón'* (see 3.1) 'fire', *derén* 'dog-berry', *dymók* (3.1) 'dim of dym; fine smoke', *došč* 'rain', *kalhán* 'kalgan, plant', *karbíž* (3.1) 'notch', *kys'íl'* (3.1) 'kissel', *kon'ják* 'cognac', *kul'íš* 'kind of soup', *kumýz* 'mare's milk', *mačók* (3.1)

'corn-poppy', *netalán* 'failure', *pad'íž* (3.1) 'cattle-plague', *pisók* (3.1) 'sand', *plač* 'weeping', *požár* 'fire', *popiléc'* (3.1), *porošók* (3.1) 'powder', *pravíž* (3.1) 'distraint', *pyríj* (3.1), *ryžíj* (3.1), *rin'ák* 'gravel', *rubíž* (3.1) 'border', *ruxl'ák* 'marl soil', *sverbíž* (3.1), *syrivéc'* (3.1), *smak* 'taste', *s'n'ižók* (3.1), *solončák* 'salt-marsh', *son* 'sleep' *-snu* (3.1), *sos'n'ák* 'pinery', *talán* 'fate, lot', *terlýč* 'gentia', *terpéc'* (3.1) 'patience', *torhún* 'cartilage', *t'ut'ún* 'tobacco', *xosén* (3.1) 'use, benefit' *-xisnú*, *čavún* 'cast iron', *čaharnýk* 'bush', *časnýk* 'garlic', *šabáš* 'stop it', *šantáž* 'black-mail', *sporýš* 'knot-grass', *ščavél'* (3.1) 'dock; sorrel', *ščyréc'* (3.1) 'pure sand', *jahidnýk* 'berry-field', and a few more.

As one can see, all these nouns have stress in the Nsg on the final syllable. All are polysyllabic except for *plač, smak, son* and *došč* (and possibly few more) being monosyllabic in Nsg.

3.3 In BELORUSSIAN the nouns under discussion can be, like in Ukrainian, monosyllabic, disyllabic and polysyllabic, e.g., *v'ek* 'century, age', *abvál* 'falling, crumbling', *abarót* 'revolution, turn over', *abixódak* 'custom, use' and can consist of one or more stems, those with one stem constituting the vast majority.

3.3.1 Stems can be hard or soft, hard stems being in overwhelming majority. Soft stems end in *n', l', j*, e.g., *ahón'* 'fire', *f'estivál'* 'festival', *n'epakój* 'anxiety'. After these consonants the vowel /u/ (i.e. the ending of Gsg) is replaced by the allophone [-u]. In stressed syllables all vowels occur, i.e., /i e u o a/; in unstressed syllables /o e/ are replaced as follows: in immediately pretonic syllables and in all unstressed syllables after "hardened" consonants /š ž č ǯ c ʒ r/ /o e/ are automatically replaced by /a/, e.g., *došč -dažšú, hrex - hraxú;* in other unstressed syllables /e/ remains, but /o/ is replaced by /a/ after "plain" consonants (i.e. non-palatalized consonants which possess a palatalized counterpart) and, after palatalized consonant, by either /a/ (simple replacement /o→a/ in all positions or by /e/ "basic vowel alternation").[11] Vowels /o a e/ preceded and followed by a consonant alternate with zero before the ending /u/, e.g., *abixódak -dku, haladók -dku, v'éc'er -tru, son -snu.* The consonant /v/ is automatically replaced by a semivowel allophone

[11] Charles E. Bidwell, *Outline of Belorussian Morphology*, Pittsburgh, 1967, p. 5.

[w] before consonant and at word-boundary. At word-boundary and before juncture voiced consonants *b d g z ž h ʒ ǯ* are replaced by their voiceless counterparts *p t k s š x c č*.

3.3.2 Stress in the Gsg usually falls on the stem syllable, except for the nouns below in which stress falls on the ending: *ahón'* 'fire' (3.3.1), *avs'úk* 'wild oat', *baháš -žú* 'luggage', *bahún* 'ledum; marsh-tea', *baʒ'ák* 'thistle', *bambúk* 'bamboo', *balík* 'balyk', *baráš -žú* 'barrage', *barkún* 'sweet clover', *baríš* 'profit, gain', *bl'iščák* 'lustre', *bur'ján* 'weed(s)', *b'arlóx* 'den, lair' — *b'erlahú, vastréc* 'sedge, carex', *vavčúk* 'rest harrow', *v'išn'ák* 'cherry orchard', *haladók* (3.3.1) 'knawel', *v'arbn'ák* 'willow plot', *hrex* (3.3.1) 'sin', *hul'áš* 'goulash', *ʒ'irván* 'grassy ground', *došč* (3.3.1) 'rain', *drenáš -žú* 'drainage', *dubl'áš -žú* 'doubling (in movies)', *dubn'ák* 'oak grove', *žav'él'* (3.3.1) 'Javel water', *zvan'éc* (3.3.1) 'rattle box', *zubn'ík* 'hawk's-beard', *inv'entár* 'inventory', *kavardák* 'mash, mess', *kavíl'* 'spear-grass', *kazal'éc* (3.3.1) 'crowfoot', *kan'ják* 'cognac', *kap'éš -žú* 'thaw', *kavčúk* 'Indian rubber', *k'iz'ák* 'thyrse flowered', *k'irmáš* 'market', *k'is'él'* 'kissel', *krap'jóš -žú* (3.3.1) 'pit-props', *kul'tinventár* 'cultural stock', *kurtáš -žú* 'brocage', *latúk* 'lettuce', *l'istáš -žú* 'number of sheets', *l'itmantáš -žú* 'literary assembling', *l'itráš -žú* 'litrage', *muróx -hú* 'hay', *m'adók -tkú* 'nectar', *paražn'ák* 'empted vehicle', *pavsón -snú* 'half-asleep', *pavxmiz'n'ák* 'semishrubbery', *plantaš -žú* 'a lot of earth for plantation of orchard, garden etc.', *plac'eš -c'ažú* 'payment', *plivun'éc -ncú* 'bladderwort', *rahav'ík* 'rescue-grass', *razák* 'water-soldier-marsh', *ruʒ'ák* 'reddish object', *salančák* 'saline, salt', *s'v'ínčák* 'plambago', *s'emačók -čkú* 'starflower', *s'iv'éc -vcú* 'devil's bit', *s'm'ašók -škú* 'chuckle', *surgúč* 'sealing-wax', *spin'ák* 'typhus', *siréc -rcú* 'raw silk', *titun'éc -ncú* 'fine tobacco', *xaladók -tkú* 'coolness'.

As one can see, all these nouns have stress on the final syllable in the Nsg, shifting to the final syllable in the Gsg.

3.4 In RUSSIAN there are 108 monosyllabic nouns, 82 disyllabic, 22 trisyllabic and all possess one stem, e.g., *sup* 'soup', *tvoróg* 'cottage cheese', *ugovór* 'persuasion'. There are no non-abbreviations with the ending -u in the Gsg.

3.4.1 Nouns with soft stems are: *boj* 'battle', *gnoj* 'pus', *kl'ej* 'glue', *kraj* 'edge, brim, land', *p'ir'ipój* 'excessive drinking', *pokój* 'rest, peace',

čaj 'tea', *d'ógot'* 'tar'; the remainder have hard stems. After /j/ and /t'/ the vowel /u/ or /a/ is replaced by the allophone [-u] or [-a] as in Ukrainian and Belorussian. Vowels /o e/ between consonants at word-boundary in Nsg alternate with zero between these consonants before the ending -a/-u, e.g., *v'ét'ir -tra/-tru* 'wind', *p'isók -ská/-skú* 'sand'. Forms with the ending *-a* or *-u* depend on their usage (see 5.3).

Voiced consonants /b d z g v ž/ at word-boundary, i.e., before zero ending in the Nsg, and before voiceless consonants are replaced by their voiceless counterparts /p t s k f š/. Vowel /o/ in unstressed position after hard consonant is replaced by /a/, and /e o/ after soft consonants are replaced by /i/.

3.4.2 Stress falls on the stem with the exception of the following nouns, which have stress on the ending: *kon'ják -á/-ú* 'cognac', *mišják -á/-ú* 'arsenic', *polk -á/-ú* 'regiment', *tabák -á/-ú* 'tobacco', *p'isók -ská/-skú* 'sand', and derivatives with stressed suffix -ok, e.g. *m'idók -tká/-tkú* 'dim. of m'ót -da/-u' (honey).

4.0 DISCREPANCIES IN UKRAINIAN DICTIONARIES

4.1 There are inconsistencies in the citation of the endings of -u and -a with some nouns listed in K&R and H dictionaries. There are 55 such cases, falling into the following six groups: 1) nouns which in K&R show the ending -a only, and in the H the ending -u only: *antycyklón* 'anticyclone', *Buh* '(river) Buh', *dijalóh* 'dialog', *épos* 'epos', *zát'inok* 'shade; shadow', *kryvávnyk* 'yarrow', *man'ikjúr* 'manicure', *mín'iimum* 'minimum', *n'itrohén* 'nitrogen', *pol'onéz* 'polonaise', *sál'nyk* 'caul, gasket', *sýfil'is* 'syphilis'; 2) nouns which in K&R appear only with the ending -u and in H only with the ending -a: *al'manáx* 'almanac', *man'i-fést* 'manifesto', *matč* 'match', *počýnok* 'spun (thread)', *radioelemént* 'radioelement', *sakvojáž* 'grip sack', *talmúd* 'talmud', *termít* (chem. tech) 'termitte', *standárt* 'standard'; 3) nouns which in K&R may have an optional ending, i.e., -a/-u and in H only the ending -a: *bal'kón* 'balcony', *mur* 'brick wall', *paz* 'groove, slot', *paráhraf* 'paragraph', *peredn'í-vok* 'time before harvest', *póhreb (=póhrib)* 'cellar' (in K&R also funeral), *póperek* 'small of the back', *portrét* 'portrait', *prápor* 'flag', *prómin'* 'ray, beam', *protokól* 'report, minutes', *sávan* 'shroud', *Séret*

'(river) Seret', *traktát* 'treatise', *trup* 'corpse', *fil'várok* 'farmyard', *fil'm* 'film', *frontón* 'pediment; fronton'; 4) nouns which in the K&R have optional -u/-a and in H the ending -u only: *l'is* 'forest, woods', *poríh* 'thrashhold', *preferáns* '(card game) preference', *punkt* 'point', *syr* 'cheese', *syrivéc*"bread kvaš, *sud* 'court', *tánec'* 'dance'; 5) nouns which in K&R have the ending -u only, and in H both endings: *budýnok* 'building', *mandát* 'mandate', *mist* 'bridge', *papír* 'paper'; 6) nouns with the exclusive ending -a in K&R and double endings in H: *dub* 'oak', *klen* 'maple', *buk* 'beech tree', *mal'únok* 'illustration, picture'.

4.1.1 With regard to these discrepancies the following suggestions seem appropriate: to consider as correct forms *Búh-u* (not *Buh-a*) and *trúp-a* (not *trúp-u*) (in group1) and as correct the forms *man'ifést-u, počýnk-u, radioelemént-u, stadárt-u* (in group 2). The optional use of the endings -a/-u seems to be justifiable for the nouns *dialóh* and *épos* (group 1), *talmúd* (group 2), *bal'kón, paráhraf, portrét, prómin', protokól, Séret, fil'várok* (group 3) and *punkt, syr, syr'véc'* (group 4); they have the same meaning with both endings. These doublets would increase the number of nouns listed in both dictionaries such as *sórom* 'shane', *styd* 'shame', *stih* 'stack, rick', *stis* 'heap, pile', *tom* 'volume', *centr* 'centre', *šynók* 'tavern', and the number of nouns listed only in K&R, namely, *fant* 'forfeit', *sékans* 'secant', *skrýtok* 'hiding place', *smok* 'pump', *samopal* 'arbalest, cross-bow', and possibly several more.

5.0 SPECIAL CASES OF USAGE

5.1 In Ukrainian a special group of nouns are those whose endings -a and -u affect the meaning of the noun; cf. the difference in the expressions: S'vjatóho *Dúxa* 'of the Holy Spirit', Bóhu *dúxa* výnen 'entirely innocent', viddáty *dúxa* 'to die', and pro n'óho n'i slúxu n'i *dúxu* 'nothing is heard of him', zanépad *dúxu* 'dispondency' and some others; *béresta* 'of one elm' and *bérestu* 'of the elm material', *vúhol'a* 'of one piece of coal' and *vúhol'u* 'of coal (collective)', *dvorá* 'of the palace' and *dvóru* 'of the yard', *oryginála* 'of an eccentric person' and *oryginálu* 'of the original (book, picture etc.)', *mal'únka* 'of the picture', and *mal'únku* 'of the scene', *mandáta* 'of the certificate', and *mandátu* 'of the

recommendation', *raxúnka* 'of the ticket, card', and *raxúnku* 'of the computation', rih-*rohá* 'of the horn', and *róhu* 'of the corner', son-*sná* 'of the dream' (when speaking of what has appeard in the dream), and *snu* 'of the dream' (when speaking of the condition or status of the dream), *stolá* 'of the table' and *stólu* (e.g. prosýty do *stólu* 'to invite to the meal') and some other.

5.1.1 Beside this group of nouns, in which the use of the ending -a and -u depends on their contextual meaning, and a very limited group of nouns in which the optional use of these endings does not affect the meaning of the noun, the rest included in the total corpus of nouns in this paper have the single ending -u regardless of word combinations containing them and regardless of their contextual meaning. For example, the noun *čaj* 'tea' : kól'ir *čáju* 'the color of the tea', skl'ánka *čáju* 'a glass of tea', skl'ánka sýl'noho *čáju* 'a glass of rich tea', ja xóču *čáju* 'I want tea', smak *čáju* 'the taste of tea' etc., in contradistinction to Russian usage, where in some word-combinations the ending -a is used more often, and in some the ending -u (see 5.3).

Nouns with the ending -u are often used in phraseological expressions, e.g., *čas vid čásu* 'from time to time', *bez ródu bez plémen'i* 'without kith or kin', *z vohn'ú ta v pólumja* 'out of the frying-pan into the fire', *zbýtys'a z pantelýku* 'to be at a loss', *z hlúzdu zjíxaty* 'to be off one's head', *dáty (vsýpaty) pérc'u* 'to give it to one hot', *žal'ú zavdaváty* 'to give sorrow, to grieve', *nasýpaty prýsku* 'to sparkle' and others.

5.2 In Belorussian, as in Ukrainian, in all the groups and subgroups the ending -u may be used in the Gsg, and in a relatively small group of nouns either -a or -u can be used depending on the lexical meaning of the nouns; i.e., these endings play a distinguishing semantic role. Nouns with both endings in different meanings are found among the names in botany, e.g., *b'ass'm'ért'n'ik* 'common immortale', *banán* 'banana', *buk* 'beech', *dup -dúba* 'oak', *kakós* 'cocoa-tree', *k'edr* 'cedar', *m'irt* 'myrtle', and others. When these nouns denote material, the ending -u is used, and when they denote a tree, they take the ending -a.

As in Ukrainian, in Belorussian the ending -u is used in many phraseological expressions, e.g. *b'es hodu tíз'en'* 'only a few days', *v'ek at v'éku* 'from now on for ever', *zb'ícca s trópu* 'to lose one's way', *zb'ic'*

s pantalíku 'to bewilder somebody', *z'v'és'c'i z rózumu* 'to drive mad', *nahnáć žáxu* 'to put fear on somebody' and others.

5.3 In Russian all 212 nouns may have double endings except for those instances when they are an integral part of phraseological units. The basic ending is -a. The ending -u is used in the following instances: 1) with nouns denoting material or substance to denote a definite quantity or part; e.g., *k'iló iz'úmu* 'kilogram of raisins', *stakán kvásu* 'a glass of kvas', *kusók síru* 'piece of cheese', etc; 2) collective and abstract nouns, e.g., *mnóga (mála) naródu* 'a lot of people', *mnóga (mála) p'iskú, s'n'égu, šúmu* etc. 'plenty of sand, snow, noise'; 3) in constructions with the prepositions *s* 'from', *do* 'to', *b'ez* 'without', *dva, iz* 'from, out of': *s (z gólasu, ž žáru; ispúgu, kráju, krúgu, l'ótu, máxu, marózu, nal'ótu, p'ir'ipúgu, pílu, razb'égu, razgónu* 'from (hunger, voice, heat, fright, verge, circle, flight, rashly, frost, with a swoop, in one's fright, ardor, running start, at a run)'; *do (l'ósku, pótu, atválu, atkázu, s'v'étu)* 'to (lustre, sweat, eating one's fill, refusal, light)'; *s, do (v'étru, pólu, p'íru, s'm'éxu)* 'from, to (wind, floor, feast, laugh); *s, ot (ad žíru)* 'from (fat)'; *s ókolo (ókala čásu)* 'from, near (time, hour)'; *b'ez (v'ésu, zóvu, prómaxu, razbóru, razgavóru, ródu, sprósu, ščótu, ubítku)* 'without (weight, call, miss, analysis, talk, kin, demand, calculation, loss)'; *dó, íz (damu)* 'to, from (home, house); *dl'a (par'átku)* 'for (order, stylishness)'; *iz-pod, s (bóku)* 'from, under, from (side)'; *s, dl'a (v'ídu)* 'from, for (view)'; 4) in phraseological word combinations: *vz'at' s sabóju* 'to take with', *z bóru da s sós'ink'i* 'chosen at random', *n'i znája bródu n'i s̆js'a v vódu* 'look before you leap', *upus't'ít' íz v'idu* 'to lose sight of', *čto s vózu upála ta prapála* 'there is no use crying over spilt milk' and some others;[12] 5) in constructions with *n'et* and *n'i: étamu pal'tó iznósu n'et* 'this coat will never wear out', *n'i skládu n'i ládu* 'neither rhyme nor reason', and others; 6) in constructions with verbs governing the direct object: *kup'ít' bárxatu* 'to buy velvet', *zadát' žaru* 'to give it hot to somebody', *pr'i-v'is't'í kórmu* 'to bring forage' etc. The Gsg in such constructions corresponds to genitive partitive.

[12] It should be mentioned that some nouns are used only in phraseological expressions, e.g., *spat' b'ez prósypu* 'sleep soundly', *úd'eržu n'et* 'unrestrainedly', and others.

6.0 DIFFERENCES

6.1 The list of the nouns in Ukrainian which semantically correspond to Belorussian and Russian, some being close or identical in form but differing in the Gsg form, follows. In Ukrainian these nouns have the ending -u; in the other two languages the ending is -a. Below they are listed in Ukrainian phonemic transcription (names of cities, rivers, islands and the like are not included in this list): *argotýzm* 'argot', *argumént* 'argument', *arxajízm* 'archaism', *basketból* 'basket-ball', *bejzból* 'baseball', *horyzónt* 'horizon', *golf* 'golf', *dekrét* 'decree', *dim* 'house', *kurs* 'course', *memorijál* 'memorial', *mikroorhan'ízm* 'microorganizm', *mit* 'myth', *naród* 'people, nation', *oryginál (pervotvír)* 'original', *pol'i-téxn'ikum* 'Politechnic', *postul'át* 'postulate', *pereláz* 'stile', *perón* 'platform', *ping-pong* 'ping-pong', *pl'an* 'plan', *pójizd* 'train', *punkt* 'point', *rajón* 'region', *rekórd* 'record', *referát* 'paper, essay', *sezón* 'season', *sylohízm* 'syllogism' *synód* 'synod', *sejm* 'seim, diet', *sobór* 'cathedral (church); council', *statút* 'statute(s), ordinance', *stil (do stólu)* 'to get meal', *tánec'* 'dance', *teátr* 'theatre', *tén'is* 'tennis', *týtul* 'title', *tron* 'throne', *tunél'* 'tunnel', *fakt* 'fact', *fakul'tét* 'faculty', *fal'c* 'groove; fold (print)', *fant* 'forfeit', *fantóm* 'phantom', *fenómen* 'phenomenon', *feód* 'feud', *fetýš* 'fetish', *flank* 'flank; wing', *fokstrót* 'fox-trot', *fórzac* '(print) fly-leaf', *forpóst* 'outpost', *fort* 'fort', *fórum* 'forum', *fotoaparát* 'camera', *fragment* 'fragment', *futból* 'football', *xram* 'temple', *cex* 'workshop', *cykl* 'cycle', *cyrk* 'circus', *cýrkul'* 'dividers', *cug* 'team of horses'.

As one can see, most of these nouns are loan-words from non-Slavic languages.

6.2 Among the nouns with -u in the Gsg, the majority are concrete nouns denoting substances, material and collective objects, e.g., in Ukrainian: *kys'íl'* 'kissel', *boršč* 'borshch', *t'ut'ún* 'tobacco', *časnýk* 'garlic', and many more; in Belorussian: *k'is'él', kon'ják* 'cognac', *burján* 'weed(s)' and many more; in Russian number of such nouns is very small: *p'isók -á/-ú* 'sand', *polk -á/-ú* 'regiment', *k'ip'atók -á/-ú* 'boiling water', *kon'ják -á/-ú, m'išják -á/-ú* and derivatives with stressed suffix -ok, e.g., *kvasók -ská/-skú* '(dim. aff. of kvass)', *čajók -jká/-jkú* '(dim. of tea)', *m'idók -tká/-tkú* '(dim. of m'ot-m'óda=honey)' and some others.

In Ukrainian and Belorussian the stress in the Nsg in these nuns

falls on the final syllable if the noun is disyllabic or polysyllabic. In Russian, stress in the Nsg of suffixless nouns and nouns with the suffix -ec-, -ek- falls on the stem (first or second syllable), and in nouns with the suffix -ok stress falls on the suffix, e.g., *pórax -a/-u* 'powder', *salát -a/-u* 'lettuce', *p'isóč'ik -čka/-čku* '(dim. aff.) sand', but *l'idók -tká/-tkú* '(dim. aff.) ice'.

6.3 In Ukrainian and Belorussian nouns with the ending -u may have one, two or more stems, but in Russian only one stem.

6.4 If a noun is accompanied by an adjective, then in Russian the use of the ending -a prevails: *stakán slátkava čája* (in transliterated spelling: *stakán sládkogo čája*) 'a glass of sweet tea', *karópka sv'éživa marm'il'áda* (in tr. spl.: *koróbka svéžego marmeljáda*) 'a box of fresh candied fruit'. Such a tendency does not exist in Ukrainian and Belorussian; the ending -u is used regardless of the presence or absence of an adjective.

6.5 In Russian if one does not think of quantity, definite or indefinite, then the ending -a is used in the Gsg: *pós'l'i čája pajd'óm pagul'át'* (in trl. spl.: *posle čaja pojdëm poguljat'*) 'After tea we shall go for a walk'. In Ukrainian and Belorussian in such cases the form with -u is used.

6.6 In Russian almost all of the nouns described under groups 1, 2, 3, 5, 6 (with the exception of group 4, see 5.3) may be used with the ending -u or -a,[13] that is, one can stay *stakán čáju* (or *čája*), *zápax č'isnaká* (or *c'isnakú*) etc., in distinction from Ukrainian and Belorussian where the use of -u is obligatory. Yet it should be mentioned that Russian idiomatic expressions containing nouns with the ending -u prefer this ending, as Golanow pointed out.[14] In Ukrainian, as a rule, there is no choice with regard to the use of -a or -u except for the few instances indicated under 5.0.

6.7 In Russian a noun with the ending -u in Gsg is not used when it depends on another word and plays the role of an attribute, e.g., *istó-*

[13] A.M. Finkel', N.M. Bažanov, *Kurs sovremennogo russkogo jazyka*, izd. 2, Kiev, 1965, pp. 282-283; AN SSSR, *Grammatika russkogo jazyka*, vol. 1, pp. 142-143.

[14] I.G. Golanov, *Morfologija sovremennogo russkogo jazyka*, Moskva, 1962, p. 58.

r'ija naróda 'history of the nation', *zapás čája* 'reserve of tea', *pradáža čaja* 'sale of tea'. As one can see, in these examples there is no indication of measure or quantity. In Belorussian, the contextual factor may play similar role, e.g., *pal'itíčnae aʒ'ínstva naróda* 'political unity of the nation', and *mnóha (mála) naróda* 'many (few) people'. In Ukrainian differentiation by measure and quantity plays no role in the choice between -a and -u.

6.8 In Russian all masculine nouns in -izm (-n'izm, -l'izm) have the ending -a in the Gsg; in Belorussian the ending is -u except for *kamun'ízm-a, l'en'in'izm, marks'izm-a, sacijal'izm-a,* and nouns with a concrete meaning, e.g., *arxaízm-a* 'of archaism', *ukrain'ízm-a* 'of ukrainianism', *m'ikraarhan'ízm-a* 'of microorganism'. In Ukrainian all nouns with this suffix take the ending -u in the Gsg.

6.9 In Russian and Belorussian all nouns denoting names of towns, rivers, mountains, islands are used with the ending -a; in Ukrainian some are used with -a and some with -u, foreign names other than those Nsg in -iv being more often used with -u.

7.0 CURRENT TENDENCIES

7.1 In modern Ukrainian there is a general tendency toward continuation and expansion of the use of the ending -u in the Gsg with all the nouns of the groups and subgroups discussed. This is evidenced by the fact that in Ukrainian the number of these nouns, formed during the course of the historical development of the Ukrainian language, is larger in comparison to Belorussian and especially to Russian, and by the fact that the current masculine gender loan-words in these groups and subgroups take the Gsg ending -u. One observes this process, e.g., in the adoption of sport-terms: *basketból-u* 'of the basket-ball', *bejsból-u* 'of the baseball', *gól'f-u* 'of the golf', *ping-póng-u* 'of the ping-pong', *tén'is-u* 'of the tennis', and others. The list of nouns under 6.1 also clearly reflect this tendency.

7.2 In contemporary Russian the opposite tendency holds, that is, a tendency to use -a in the Gsg of the masculine nouns under discussion, evidenced by the very small number of nouns with the optional ending

-u. Such nouns, whether abstract or concrete, were used in the 18th and 19th centuries more often and in larger number than now.[15] The authors of the *Grammatika russkogo jazyka* say that today using forms with -u is not the only possible use; alongside -u one also may use the ending -a, provided such forms do not coincide with adverbs and do not constitute part of a phraseological expression.[16] Even more emphatic in this aspect are Finkel' and Bažanov: "Forms in -a are replacing the forms in -u, the latter being recently used less and less; they are used more often in colloquial Russian. Instead of the Gsg form in -u one may always use form with ending -a in this case, while the opposite replacement (i.e., replacing -a with -u, W.J.) is quite limited. As for loan-words, the ending -u with them is not used at all."[17] A similar statement was made by Golanov.[18]

7.3 In contemporary Belorussian the noticible tendency is toward using the ending -u with some nouns and the ending -a with others. One observes the first in the case of nouns with suffix -izm [-yzm], denoting civic organizations, social-political and scientific trends, scientific theories and doctrines, e.g., *real'ízm* 'realism', *trahízm* 'tragedy', *marksízm* 'marxism', etc., as well as abstract nouns denoting natural phenomena, elemental disasters and so on, e.g., *praŕiv* 'break-through', *pažár* 'fire'. As recently as the first half of the 20th century, in artistic and publicistic works such nouns were used with the ending -a; now only few of them are used traditionally with this ending (see 6.8), others with suffix -izm (-yzm) and the ending -a are no longer considered literary.[19]

In colloquial style and in artistic literature (especially in the first half of the 20th century) the ending -u was also used with nouns of a concrete meaning denoting space, place of action or direction of motion, e.g., *kal'a (móstu)* 'by the bridge', *b'érahu* 'river bank', *paróhu* 'thrashold', *hánku* 'porch', *uzhórku* 'hill', *aharódu* 'kitchen garden', *parkánu*

[15] AN SSSR, *Grammatika...*, op. cit., p. 142.
[16] Ibidem.
[17] A.M. Finkel', N.M. Bažanov, op. cit., pp. 142-143.
[18] I.G. Golanov, op. cit., p. 57.
[19] K.K. Atraxovič (Krapiva), *Hramatyka beraruskaj movy*, vol. 1, Minsk, 1962, pp. 49-50.

'fence', *častakólu* 'paling, palisade', *tratuáru* 'pavement', *dómu* 'house', *palácu* 'palace', *dáxu* 'roof', *pav'érku* 'storey', *Mínsku* 'Minsk', *hóradu* 'city', *pas'ólku* 'settlement', *stóhu* 'stack', *róhu* 'horn', *pl'ácu* 'farmstead', and others.[20] Only four of them listed in the Krapiva dictionary (see 2.0) have the ending -u, the rest having the ending -a, indicating a tendency toward using -a. It is difficult to determine whether this tendency is motivated by an element of the Belorussian language or by the external influence of the Russian language with its characteristic and dominating ending -a.

[20] Ibidem, p. 49.

Deverbal Suffixless Masculine Nouns in Modern Ukrainian

1. In Modern Ukrainian, as in other Slavic languages, there are two kinds of noun formation: paradigmatic and derivational,[1] the latter being both syntactic and lexical. The meaning of a syntactic derivative is identical with the meaning of its deriving word; the derived word differs from the deriving one only by belonging to different parts of speech, and subsequently, by its different syntactic function in the context. Here belong deverbal nouns denoting action (*čytánnja* 'reading', *likuvánnja* 'medical treatment'); adjectival nouns with the meaning of an abstract feature (*bilyzná* 'whiteness', *čornotá* 'blackness', *vesélist'* 'gaiety, cheerfulness'); and denominal adjectives denoting an abstract, non-concretized relationship to the content of the deriving base (*nebésnyj* 'heavenly', *zemnýj* 'earthly').

[1] Opinions differ as to whether derivation belongs to lexicology or morphology. The first view is advocated, e.g., by A.V. Isačenko: "Die Bildung neuer Wörter hat mit der Morphologie, welche die Bildung von Formen ein und desselben Wortes untersucht, nichts zu schaffen", *Die Russische Sprache der Gegenwart,* Teil I: *Formenlehre* (Halle/Saale, 1962), p. 9. However, this view has no firm grounds and cannot be accepted. More convincing is Stankiewicz's view that the "derivation and paradigmatic levels are both synchronically and diachronically in a state of independence, and neither level can be fully understood without considering the ways in which it circumscribes and modifies the other". ("The Interdependence of Paradigmatic and Derivational Patterns", *Word,* XVIII, 1962, 3.) Also Dean S. Worth regards derivation "as an integral part of the morphological system, whose relation to the flectional system is one not of autonomy but of interdependence". ("The Notion of Stem in Russian Flection and Derivation", *On the Structure and History of Russian,* München: Otto Sagner, 1977, pp. 101-120.)

Lexical derivatives are those whose lexical meaning differs from the meaning of their base words, e.g., *čytač* 'reader, < *čytaty, líkar* 'physician' < *likuváty, vynaxídnyk* 'inventor' < *vynaxódyty.*

In both types of derivatives, lexical and syntactic, "the presence of semantic derivativeness is obligatory and sufficient indication of derivational relationship." This general statement made by some linguists, e.g., by I.I. Kovalyk,[2] is correct with regard to affixal word-building but it does not explain the direction of the derivational process with regard to deverbative masculine nouns with no suffixal morpheme. This is one of the questions raised in this article. Other questions include the genetic aspect of the formation of the above nouns and their lexical-semantic relationship to their motivating verbs; morphonemic changes accompanying this formation and irregularities in these changes; and the question of the productivity of the nouns discussed.

So far these questions in regard to Modern Ukrainian have not been given proper attention. Some grammarians do not mention such nouns at all in their books,[3] and some indicate their existence but do not discuss them.[4] O.F. Pinčuk in his chapter "Slovotvirna struktura viddijeslivnyx imennykiv sučasnoji ukrajins'koji literaturnoji movy"[5] gives somewhat more information but it too is limited and superficial. Some valuable statements with regard to the semantic difference between this type of noun and deverbal nouns with the suffixes *-nn(ja), -tt(ja)* have been observed by Yurij Šerex (=George Y. Shevelov).[6]

[2] AN URSR, *Slovotvir sučasnoji ukrajins'koji movy* (Kyjiv: Naukova dumka, 1979), p. 10.

[3] E.g., O.M. Parxomenko *Ukrajins'ka mova* (Kyjiv: Radjans'ka škola, 1954), pp. 199-218.

[4] M.P. Ivčenko, *Sučasna ukrajins'ka literaturna mova* (Kyjiv: Vyd. Kyjivs'koho universytetu, 1965), p. 240; O. Synjavs'kyj, *Normy ukrajins'koji literaturnoji movy,* 3 vyd. ("Žyttja i škola", 1967), p. 115; M.A. Žovtobrjux and B.M. Kulyk, *Kurs sučasnoji ukrajins'koji literaturoji movy,* 3 vyd. (Kyjiv: 1965), p. 204; I.K. Bilodid, *Sučasna ukrajins'ka literaturna mova* (Kyjiv: AN URSR, 1969), pp. 46-47; O.T. Volox, M.T. Čemerysov, Je.I. Černov, *Sučasna ukrajins'ka literaturna mova* (Kyjiv: Vyšča škola, 1976), p. 145.

[5] AN URSR, *Morfolohična budova sučasnoji ukrajins'koji movy* (Kyjiv: Naukova dumka, 1975), pp. 45-46.

[6] Yurij Šerex (=George Y. Shevelov), *Narys sučasnoji ukrajins'koji literaturnoji movy* (München: NTSh, 1951), pp. 208-209.

1.1. The main source of the material investigated in this paper has been volume 11 of *Slovnyk ukrajins'koji movy* of the AN URSR.[7] Also consulted were *Ukrajins'ko-nimec'kyj slovnyk* by Z. Kuzelja and J.B. Rudnyc'kyj,[8] *Ukrajins'ko-anhlijs'kyj slovnyk* by M.L. Podvesko,[9] *Anhlo-ukrajins'kyj slovnyk* by M.L. Podvesko, M.I. Balla,[10] *Ukrajins'ko-rosijs'kyj slovnyk* by V.S. Il'jin and others,[11] *Pravopysnyj slovnyk,* 8 ed., by H. Holoskevyč,[12] *Handwörterbuch zu der altkirchenslavischen Texten* by L. Sadnik,[13] and *Leksyčnyj fond literaturnoji movy kyjivs'koho periodu X-XIVst,* by P. Kovaliv.[14]

1.2. *Formal conventions.* In this paper the following notations are used: hyphens separate structural parts (morphemes). Zero morpheme is indicated by #, and addition of a morpheme by +. Morphonemic transcriptions are given in curved brackets { }, phonemic transcriptions in slants / /, alternation is indicated by ~. These notations are used only in the examples illustrating derivational processes; otherwise they are omitted and transliteration of Cyrillic used by Slavic and East European Journal is applied. A * before a word denotes a reconstructed word or element. Marks > or < denote direction of the development, namely, the word or form listed beyond the edge of the angle or before it developed from the word or form listed before the wide part of the angle or beyond it. The abbreviations impf, pf, and inf denote "imperfective aspect," "perfective aspect," and "infinitive" respectively. The letters C and V stand for "consonant" and "vowel" respectively. Ukrainian words consisting of two or more syllables are stressed.

[7] AN URSR, *Slovnyk ukrajins'koji movy,* 11 vls. (Kyjiv: AN URSR, 1970-1981).

[8] Zenon Kuzelja and Jaroslaw B. Rudnyc'kyj, *Ukrajins'ko-nimec'kyj slovnyk* (Leipzig: Otto Harrasowitz, 1943).

[9] M.L. Podvesko, *Ukrajins'ko-anhlijs'kyj slovnyk,* 1954.

[10] M.L. Podvesko and M.I. Balla, *Anhlo-ukrajins'kyj slovnyk* (Kyjiv: Radjans'ka škola, 1974).

[11] V.S. Il'jin, K.P. Dorošenko, S.P. Levčenko and others, *Ukrajins'ko-rosijs'kyj slovnyk* (Kyjiv: Naukova dumka, 1965).

[12] H. Holoskevyč, *Pravopysnyj slovnyk,* 8 ed. (New York, 1955).

[13] Linda Sadnik and R. Aizetmüller, *Handwörterbuch zu den altkirchenslavischen Texten* ('s-Gravenhage and Geidelberg, 1955).

[14] P. Kovaliv, *Leksyčnyj fond literaturnoji movy kyjivs'koho periodu X-XIV st.* (New York: NTSh, 1962).

2. Suffixless masculine nouns in the Slavic languages originally developed on the basis of the suffixal formation of nouns in the prehistoric period of Slavic by means of the thematic suffix *-ŏ-* which was transformed into the ending -ъ after the final morphological suffix *-s* in that period was dropped due to the tendency of the "law of open syllables." Cf. **voz-ŏ-s* **voz-ŭ-s* **voz-ŭ* **voz-ъ*.[15] On this model many masculine nouns were formed from verbal roots and from prefixed verbal stems in all Slavic languages. They are found in Old Church Slavic, e.g., in unprefixed form: *běgъ, blǫdъ, govorъ, kovъ, lovъ, morъ, svarъ, skokъ, sporъ, tvorъ, tokъ* etc., and in prefixed form: *vъsxodъ, istokъ, načьnъ, otъvetъ, ponosъ, sъborъ, užasъ,* and others; in the language of Kievan Rus': *běgъ, bludъ, hovorъ, kovъ, lovъ, morъ, sudъ, tokъ, istokъ, najezdъ, otъvetъ, ponosъ, sъborъ, užasъ,* etc. Eventually the ending ъ was lost, first in South Slavic, and then in East Slavic,[16] and the nouns acquired a zero suffix and zero ending in the nominative/accusative singular. The original small stock of such nouns increased in all Slavic languages in the course of their development in concomitance with morphonemic changes in each language. Here are some examples in four modern languages according to spelling, scientific transliteration being used for Ukrainian and Russian.

Ukrainian	Russian	Polish	Czech	English
svyst	svist	s'wist	hvizd	whistling
trisk	tresk	trzask	chrst	crack, snap
bih	beg	bieg	běh	run, running
rist	rost	wzrost	růst	growth

[15] Linguists such as Miloš Dokulil (*Tvoření slov v češtině, 1, Teorie odvozování slov,* Praha: Československé Akademie Věd, 1962, p. 592), V.P. Besedina-Nevzorova (*Staroslavjanskij jazyk,* Moscow, 1963, p. 266) and many others state that the suffix *-ŏ-* together with the ending *-s* gave -ъ. However, more correct is G.Y. Shevelov's opinion that final *-s* was lost in Common Slavic approximately by the 6th century (*Prehistory of Slavic,* New York, 1965, pp. 227-229); ъ arose only by the beginning of the 9th century (same book, pp. 436-439).

[16] The loss of ъ, ь (jers) for Slavic as a whole is to be placed in the period between the early tenth century and the middle of the thirteenth; see Shevelov's *Prehistory of Slavic,* p. 459.

kryk	krik	krzyk	krik	cry, scream
xov	———	chow	chov	raise
rózdil	razděl	rózdzial	ródzil	division

3. There are two groups of masculine nouns without suffix whose base correlates with or is identical to the base of the corresponding verbs: nouns whose base is equal to the verbal root (with possible alternation of vowels), e.g., *bih* 'run, running' and *bíhty* 'to run'; and nouns whose base contains the verbal root together with prefix, e.g., *výdyx* 'expiration' and *vydyxáty* 'to expire'. Most linguists call these nouns deverbal (or verbal) suffixless nouns.

The first group of these nouns in Modern Ukrainian is represented by about 90 examples, the other by about 710 examples, based on the 11 volume of *Slovnyk ukrajins'koji movy,* AN URSR.[17] Dialectal, regional and low colloquial expressions are not included in the discussion.

3.1. *Suffixless nouns with the stem corresponding to the verb root.* From the etymological point of view one may also consider as suffixless nouns such examples as *stil-#-#* 'table', *plit-#-#* 'fence' etc., whose stems are traced to the verb roots **stъl-a-ti* and **plet-ti* respectively. However, these nouns have undergone a total semantic divergence from corresponding verbs, losing all verbal features; therefore they cannot be considered now as deverbal nouns.

The stems of other examples of the first group of nouns and the roots of the corresponding verbs are the same but one cannot determine with absolute certainty the consecutiveness of the derivational process for each noun. In many cases we follow our linguistic feeling to make the determination which seems to have psycholinguistic grounds. Nouns of this type are abstract, and in relationship to their corresponding verbs, present a higher stage of thinking; that is, abstract notion is built on its lower stage — concrete verbal meanings. For instance, we feel strongly that the noun *xid* 'going, motion', *bih* 'running', *rist* 'growth',

[17] The Kuzelja and Rudnyc'kyj *Ukrajins'ko-nimec'kyj slovnyk* lists about the same number of the unprefixed nouns with verbal roots and about 750 nouns formed from prefixed verbs.

hin 'impulse, drive', *hnit* 'oppression', *let* 'flight' etc. are formed from the corresponding verbs *xodýty* 'to go, walk', *bíhaty* 'to run', *rostý* 'to grow', *honýty* 'to drive', *hnitýty* 'to oppress', *letíty* 'to fly'; however, one would hesitate to make such a statement in case of the noun *spix* 'a hurry' and its correlative verb *spišýty* 'to hurry', or *bunt* 'revolt' and *buntuváty* 'to revolt'. From the synchronic point of view we would consider *spix* the derivative of *spyšyty* (with the historical alternation /x~š/, but from the diachronical standpoint *spyšyty* was formed from *spěx-ъ* which in its turn was formed from *spě-ti.* Even more uncertainty arises with regard to *bunt* and *buntuváty(sja).* It is difficult to determine whether the noun was derived from the verb or vice versa. According to the *Etymological Dictionary of the Ukrainian Language* by J.B. Rudnyc'kyj this noun appeared in Ukrainian in the 16th c. Unfortunately, the dictionary does not indicate the time of the appearance of the verb *buntuváty(sja).* However, since the noun *bunt* was borrowed from the German noun "Bund" and the suffix *-uva-* and infinitive formant *-ty(sja)* are characteristic of Ukrainian, not German, these elements must have been attached to the noun *bunt* after it had been borrowed. Therefore it is justifiable to state that the verb *buntuváty(sja)* was derived from the noun *bunt* and not vice versa. However, such cases seem to be rare in the realm of unprefixed masculine nouns identical with the corresponding unprefixed verb roots; in general, we consider verb roots as motivating bases of such nouns.

3.1.1. Since many nouns of the first group, that is, nouns formed from unprefixed verbs, are motivated by both aspectual variants of the verb, their aspectual meaning depends on the context in which they are used. For instance, the noun {*kryk*}-{#}-{#} 'shout', {*z'ax*}-{#}-{#} 'dismay, fright',{*rysk*}-{#}-{#} 'risk' may indicate durative and interative action, or an instantaneous, single action. In the first case our linguistic feeling associates them with the impf aspect verbs {*kryč*}-{*á*}-{*ty*} (/*k~č*/)[18] 'to shout out, {*žax*}-{a^1}-{*ty*} 'to frighten', {*rysk*}-{*uvá*}-{*ty*} 'to

[18] /*k~č*/: a reflection of the first palatalization; **krik-ě-ti* > **krič-ě-ti* **krič-a-ti* > *kryč-a-ty.*

risk' expressing durative, continuous or repeated action, and in the second case — with the pf aspect verbs {*krýk*}-{*nu*}-{*ty*} 'to shout once (single time)', {*žax*}-{*nú*}-{*ty*} 'to have frightened', {*rysk*}-{*nú*}-{*ty*} 'to have risked'; cf. *Zdaléka donósyvsja sumnýj kryk žuravlív* (durative action); *Z hrudéj prostrílenoho bijcjá proníssja ostánnij kryk* (instantaneous action). Nevertheless, impf aspect verbs with the suffix *-nu-* which have no pf aspect partner serve as bases for the formation of nouns tending to indicate durative action, e.g., *tysk* 'pressure' from *tysnúty* 'to press'.[19]

The first group of nouns includes those at whose base lies an aspectual pair of single verbs differentiated by only stem-forming suffixes (and possible alternating final root consonants), namely, suffix *-a-(-uva-)* in the impf aspect, and suffix *-nu-* in the pf aspect. The general shape of the roots is (C)CVC(V)(C). Most roots are monosyllabic and identical, witht he exception of some examples involving vowel or consonant alternation. All verbs serving as deriving bases of these nouns belong to the first conjugation, of the type *pyšeš, čytaješ.*

3.1.2. Many nouns of this group have a tendency to express an instantaneous action even if they have coexisting aspectual pairs of simple verbs. This interpretation occurs especially in those cases where we envisage durative action as a repetition of instantaneous sounds or movements and particularly when we express such nouns as isolated units, that is, without context. Nouns of this group expressing sounds or movements are: *blysk* 'lustre, glitter' < *blýsk-a-ty, blýs-nu-ty,*[19] *hrjuk* 'bang, slam', *huk* 'hail, whoop', *hyk* 'hoop', *klyk* 'call, cry', *klip* 'wink', *kop* 'kick', *kyv* 'nod, bed', *lusk*[19] 'crash, noise', *max* 'stroke, wave', *myh* 'wink, blink', *plesk*[19] 'splash, lap', *pysk*[19] 'squeak, chirp', *ryk* 'roaring', *ryp* 'creak', *skryp* 'squeak, scroop', *stuk* 'knock', *svyst*[20] 'whistle', *šélest*[20] 'rustle', *trisk*[19] 'crash, crack', *trosk*[19] 'striking, flogging', *trus* 'shaking; search', *xljost*[20] 'whip', *xljup* 'splash', *xrusk*[19] 'crackling', *xlyp* 'sob, whimper', *xux* 'blow, puff', *xryp* 'wheeze, rattle', *xrjask*[19] 'crash, crackle',

[19] *k* of the sequence *sk* is dropped before the suffix *-nu-; *tisknqti* > **tisnqti* > **tisnuti* > *tysnuty.*

[20] *t* of the sequence *st* is dropped before the suffix *-nu-: svystaty, svysnuty.*

xyt 'shake, sway', *zojk* 'wail, yell'. Many of these nouns are often used as interjections with the stylistic function of onomatopoeic expressions.

3.1.3. Some nouns of this group are motivated by impf aspect verbs possessing a suffix other than *-nu-*, namely, *-i-*, *-y-*, *-uva-*, and having no pf aspect variants to form aspectual pairs; although prefixal pf forms exist, they do not form aspectual pairs with these impf verbs. In some cases derivational process of these nouns involves the morphonemic alternation {*o~i*}. Examples (the number by the noun in parentheses indicates first or/and second conjugation of the deriving verb): *bij*(1) 'battle, combat' *(bj-u, býty, ubýty)*, *bih*(1) 'run' *(bíhaty/pobíhaty, bíhty/pobíhty)*, *xid*(2) 'going, motion' *(xodýty/poxodýty)*. Other examples include: *hart*(1) 'hardening, temper', *hin*(2) 'drive', *hlum*(2) 'mockery', *hóhit*(1 or 2) 'cackle', *hnit*(2) 'press; oppression', *hómin*(2) 'sound of voices', *hóvir*(2) 'sound of talking', *húhit*(1) 'ring, boom', *hud*(1) 'hum, drone', *kvas*(2) 'sour fermented drink', *lément*(2) 'cry', *lépet*(1) 'babble', *let*(2) 'flight', *ljak*(1) 'fright', *lov*(2) 'catching, catch, take', *pal*(1) 'heat', *plav*(1) 'stream; litter floating on the river's surface', *spir*(2) 'dispute', *spiv*(1) 'singing', *spix*(2) 'hurry', *stúhin*(2) 'buzzing, drone', *sum*(1) 'sadness', *strum*(1) 'current', *sum*(2) 'noise', *ščébet*(1) 'twitter', *šal*(1) 'frenzy, fury', *tjah*(1) 'pull(ing)', *torh*(1) 'bargain; trade', *trépet*(1 or 2) 'tremble', *vhav*(1) 'cease, stop', *var*(2) 'intense heat; pitch (=cooked tar'.[21]

Twenty-five of these nouns are motivated by impf intransitive verbs. Those having intransitive verbs as their base tend to express durative action or state, especially when used out of context. Nouns motivated by transitive verbs usually denote durative action, but some can also acquire a specific or concrete meaning. This process of concretization is called by Charles E. Townsend "hypostasis".[22] Hypostasis takes place when the object in mind is inanimate; e.g., *lov (lovýty)* can mean 'catching, hunting' and also 'that which was caught; catch, take'. Cf. *Lov výnahorodyv rybálok. Za dóbu výpovnyly voný barkás po bortý*

[21] In Soviet Ukrainian dictionaries: 1) intense heat; 2) pitch (=cooked tar). In the *Ukrajins'ko-nimec'kyj slovnyk* by Kuzelja and Rudnyc'kyj: 1) juice extracted from fruits by boiling; 2) intense heat.

[22] Charles E. Townsend, *Russian Word Formation* (New York: Mc Graw-Hill, 1968), p. 152.

(Tulub, *Ludolovy*) 'Catch (=the amount of caught fish) rewarded the fishermen. Within twenty four hours they filled the launch up to the boards'.

It is tempting to accept Dokulil's assumption with regard to the evolution of lexical meanings of deverbal masculine nouns without suffix. According to this Czech scholar, such nouns originally expressed a complexity of action as well as the material object on which the action was demonstrated. Only later, with the evolution of human thinking, did the components of that complexity begin to differ: some nouns coming to denote concrete objects, e.g., *plit* 'fence' (**pletti*), *stil* 'table' (*stъ*lati*), some acquiring the meaning of an action, e.g., *dóviz* 'delivery'. In some, both meanings developed, that of abstract action and that of concrete object.[23]

The root of the verb *lov-ý-ty* was "lexicalized", became a noun *lov-#-#* with the original meaning of the action 'catching' which then passed over to the object, most frequently "fish"; gradually, the result of the action, that is, the amount of caught fish, took the form of the noun of action *lov*. As Yurij Šerex (=George Shevelov) correctly observed, "deverbal nouns with zero suffix denote the action in a more abstract way, the action as such, beyond the time of its course",[24] which allows them to become "objectivized".

4. *Deverbal masculine nouns without suffix formed from prefixed verbs.* Example: {*v-xód-y-ty*} > {*vxod-*} > {*vxid-*} + {#suffix} + {#ending} 'entrance'. The headword *vxid* in this string becomes an abstract noun with the primary meaning of "action" and the secondary concrete meaning of "an opening or space for entrance into the interior of a lodging"; the whole string serves for further types of derivation, namely, the generation of the flectional stem of *vxid* {*vxid-*} on one hand, and the generation of all derived words on the other (e.g., *vxid-n-ýj*).

Whereas masculine nouns without suffix correlative with unprefixed verbs can sometimes create uncertainty with regard to the chrono-

[23] M. Dokulil, *Tvoření slov v češtině*, 1, ... p. 592.

[24] Yurij Šerex (=George Y. Shevelov), *Narys sučasnoji ukrajins'koji literaturnoji movy* (München: NTSh, 1951), p. 209.

logical aspect of their derivational process, masculine nouns with zero suffix correlative with *prefixed* verbs are not concomitant with such uncertainty. In such instances, the verbs comprise the motivating, deriving base of the corresponding nouns. Cf. *perépyt* 'repeated inquiry' and *perepýtuvaty* 'to inquire over again'. As for the formation of the noun *perépyt* one cannot consider it to be a result of the addition of the prefix *pere-* to the noun *pyt* because such a noun does not exist; consequently, the prefix must have been added to the verbal stem. Secondly, the noun *perépyt* cannot be considered the deriving base of the verb *perepýtuvaty* because semantically it is identical with the abstract noun *perepýtuvannja* 'repeated questioning'. The only difference between them consists in that *perepýtuvannja* denotes a durative or iterative action, while *perépyt* can indicate durative as well as completed action. Since *perepýtuvannja* is a derivative of *perepýtuvaty,* the noun *perépyt,* with almost identical meaning, leads us to infer that it also is a derivative of that verb.

However, there are instances where the root of the prefixed verb exsists in the form of an independent noun, e.g., *-xod-* in the verb *vxódyty* 'to enter' exists as the noun *xid* (with *o* changed to *i* in closed syllable; see below). Thus, it may seem that the noun *vxid-#-#* 'entrance' could be formed by adjoining the prefix *v-* to the noun *xid-#-#*. But this is not the case. The first of these nouns was formed from the verb *vxódyty* 'to enter' and not by way of *v* + *xid-#-#*, as is evidenced by their close semantic relationship, much closer than that between *vxid* and *xid.* The semantic closeness between two words is one of the most significant criteria for determining their derivational relationship to one another. In addition, the formation of nouns by prefixation (prefix + noun > noun) has never been productive in Ukrainian.

4.1. The stems of zero-suffix masculine nouns formed from *prefixed* verbs can coincide: a) with the bases of the prefixed impf aspect verb only, the prefixed pf verb not existing; b) with the bases of the prefixed pf aspect verb only, the prefixed impf verb not existing; c) with both bases: of the prefixed impf and the prefixed pf verbs; d) with the bases of the prefixed impf verb, certain morphonemic changes having occurred in the bases of the prefixed pf verb; e) with the bases of the prefixed pf verbs, certain morphonemic changes having occurred in the

bases of the prefixed impf verbs; f) in addition, the noun can differ morphonemically from both verbal bases.

The general shape of the roots of prefixed deriving verb is the same as that of unprefixed deriving verbs (see 3.1.1.). Deriving verbs are transitive, intransitive, or (a relatively small number) reflexive. Prefixes participating in their formation are (according to frequency): *vy-, roz- (rozi-), po-, za-, pro-, na-, pry-, s-, vid- (vidi-), pere-, do-, v-, z-, u-, pid-(pidi-), ob-, o-, nad-*. Most roots are monosyllabic.

Nouns under a) are motivated by impf aspect verbs of the first conjugation which have no pf partners. The number of such nouns is very limited. They are: *nádzir* 'supervision' < *nadzyráty; násmix* 'mockery' < *nasmixátysja; óbzir* 'field of view (milit.)' < *obzyráty; póviv* 'soft blowing of wind' < *poviváty; pódyv* 'admiration' < *podyvljáty; porýv* 'gust; passion' < *poryváty; pólysk* 'lustre, gleam' < *polýskuvaty; pósmix* 'derision, mockery' < *posmixátysja; prýdyx* 'aspiration' < *prydyxáty; uháv* 'interruption' < *uhaváty; ústrij* 'regime order' < *ustrójuvaty; vídblysk* 'reflection, gleam' < *vidblýskuvaty; výblysk* 'flare, flash' < *vyblýskuvaty*. These nouns have a tendency to express durative or iterative action with the exception of the last two which are usually understood as instantaneous actions.

Under group b) fall about 25 nouns according to the 11 vol. *Slovnyk ukrajins'koji movy*. The overwhelming majority of the motivating verbs belong to the first conjugation (the number in parentheses indicates the conjucation): *nápys* 'inscription' < *napysáty*(1); *nárys* 'outline' < *narysuváty*(1); *pryvít* 'regards' < *pryvitáty*(1); *polét* 'flight' < *poletíty* (2); *pohovír* 'gossip' < *pohovorýty*(2); *pokís* 'reaped (mowed) strip of field (meadow)' < *pokosýty*(2); *pónjux* 'pinch of snuff' < *ponjúxaty*(2); *poríz* 'cut, wound' < *porízaty*(1); *pórub* 'forest-offence' < *porubáty*(1); *póslux* 'obedience' < *poslúxaty*(2); *potóp* 'flood' < *potopýty*(2); *póčerk* 'hand-writing' < *počerkáty*(1); *perelják* 'freight, shock' < *pereljakáty*(1); *postíj* 'quartering' < *postójaty*(2); *rózbrat* 'enmity' < *rozbratátysja*(1); *rozhnív* 'anger' < *rozhnívaty(sja)*(1); *skin* 'death' < *skonáty*(1); *sxov* 'keeping, storing' < *sxováty*(1); *ukís* 'hay harvest' < *ukosýty*(2); *ukól* 'prick' < *ukolóty*(1); *vývyx* 'dislocation' < *vývyxnuty*(1); *zápax* 'smell, odor' < *zapáxnuty*(1); *záblud* 'losing one's way' < *zabludýtysja*(2) and a

few more. Almost all of them are abstract and denote completed action or its result; only a few of them, namely, *nápys, nárys, pokís, poríz, pórub* are hypostasized, that is, have concrete meaning.

The group of nouns under c) is the largest, comprising about 190 members. Examples include: *vpys* 'entry' *vpýsuvaty, vpysáty; vstup* 'proem' *vstupáty, vstupýty; výzysk* 'exploitation' < *vyzýskuvaty, výzyskaty; násyp* 'bank' < *nasypáty, nasýpaty; pókaz* 'show' < *pokázuvaty, pokazáty; pídpys* 'signature' < *pidpýsuvaty, pidpysáty,* etc. The motivating impf aspect verbs with the thematic suffixes *-a-, -uva-* belong to the first conjugation and their pf partners have thematic vowels *-y-, -nu-*. As for the nouns of this group there is a tendency to use them more often in the durative aspectual meaning, a fact which reflects the prevailing influence of the impf aspect verb. However, a secondary meaning, referring to the result of the action or its hypostasization is characteristic of many of these nouns. Cf. *(Engelhardt) za výkup Ševčenka zaprávyv 2500 karbóvanciv* (P. Myrnyj), and *Engelhardtu dalý bážanyj výkup.* In the first sentence *výkup* 'redemption' is used as an abstract noun with durative aspectual meaning; in the second sentence *výkup* is a hypostasized noun meaning 'ransom' (i.e., amount of 2500 karb.).

Some nouns of this group tend to denote instantaneous action, e.g., *výbux* 'explosion', *póklyk* 'call, shout', *výdyx* 'expiration', *pókryk* 'call, cry'. Cf. *Z desjatkiv hrudéj výxopyvs' rádisnyj pókryk* (M. Kocjubyns'kyj). The meaning of durative or instantaneous action with these nouns often depends on the greater frequency of use of the aspectual verbs; for example, we understand more often the foregoing nouns as expressions of instantaneous action but the noun *óbíh* 'circulation' as referring to durative imperfective action. This group also contains hypostasized nouns, e.g., *výriz* 'notch; low neck (of dress)'. The important factor in determining the above lexical meanings of these nouns is the context in which they occur.

Second largest group of the nouns discussed are those of type d). Their total number is about 180. Some examples include *vhyn* 'fold' < *vhnáty, uhnúty; vjizd* 'entry, drive' < *vjizdýty, vjíxaty.* The following prefixes are contained in the verbs motivating the suffixless nouns with

the root *-jizd-: do-, na-, ob-, pere-, pid-, pry-, pro-, roz-, v-, vid-, vy-, za-, z-.*

The overwhelming majority of the deriving verbs of these nouns belong to the first conjugation and have the thematic vowel *-a-;* a small number with the thematic vowel *-y-* (e.g., *vjizd-ý-ty*) belong to the second conjugation. Nouns of this group have a tendency to be used in the meaning of durative action or its result, the latter being particularly characteristic of nouns derived from verbs with prefixes *na-, nad-,* and *vy-* (cf. *nakáz, nadríz, výtysk* etc.). The total number of nouns of group e) found in the *Slovnyk ukrajins'koji movy* is about 120. Examples include: *vývar* 'decoction' < *vývaryty; dóslid* 'experiment' < *doslidýty; zahýn* 'death, destruction' < *zahýnuty; óbslid* 'inspection' < *obslidýty; perepál* 'overburning; slag, scoria' < *perepalýty; rózlad* 'dissonance, discord' < *rozládyty; umolót* 'yield of grain' < *umolotýty* and others. Some deriving verbs belong to the first conjugation, and some to the second. Some nouns are used in abstract meaning only (*óbslid, zahýn, rózlad* etc.) while in some also a secondary meaning of concrete object has developed (*vývar, perepál, vmist* etc.).

If the motivating verbs of these nouns are transitive and the object on which the action passes over is concrete and inanimate, the primary tendency of these nouns is to express the action; a secondary tendency is to denote the concrete object one has in mind. If the motivating verb is intransitive, the corresponding noun has an abstract meaning of action or state (e.g., *zahýn*).

The last group of deverbal masculine nouns without suffix formed from prefixed verbs, that is, nouns differing morphonemically from both bases, impf and pf aspect verbs, numbers around 150. A few examples would be: *vviz* 'import' *vvózyty, vveztý; výbij* 'pot-hol' < *vybyváty, výbyty, výbju; vxid* 'entrance; portal' < *vxódyty, vvijtý; výbir* 'choice, selection' < *vybyráty, výbraty; výhin* 'common pasture' < *vyhónyty* and *vyhanjáty, výhnaty; pórux* 'movement' < *porúšuvaty, porúšyty* and others. Deriving verbs belong to the first or second conjugation. Nouns of this group tend to be used primarily as abstract denominals; many of them have developed hypostasized meaning. Cf. *Pry vxódi v rik novýj pohlján'mo vzad, na té, ščo my probúly* (I.

Franko), the noun *vxid* denotes action, and *Samyj menšyj, molodšyj sydýt' kólo vxódu u pečéru* (Vovčok), where *vxid* means 'place'.

5. MORPHONEMIC ALTERNATIONS BETWEEN DERIVATIONAL STEMS AND DERIVATIVE NOUNS

5.1. {o} in an open syllable of the root of an unprefixed deriving verb changes to {i} in the closed syllable of the root of the corresponding suffixless noun.[25] This alternation, characteristic of the Ukrainian language and comprising one of the features differentiating it from all other Slavic languages, occurs in the following verb - noun correlatives: *brodýty* > *brid* 'ford', *honýty(sja)* > *hin* 'drive', *hohotáty* > *hóhit* 'cackle, loud laughter', *homoníty* > *homin* 'sound of voices', *hovorýty* > *hovir* 'rumour', *huhotíty* > *huhit* 'rumble, boom', *dzvonýty* > *dzvin* 'ringing; bell', *klelotíty* > *klekit* 'gurgle, bubbling; scream', *klopotáty* > *klópit* 'trouble, worry', *loskotáty* > *lóskit* 'tickling' *krojíty* > *krij* 'cut; shape', *rostý* > *rist* 'height, growth', *skrehotáty* > *skréhit* 'gritting of teeth', *stuhoníty* > *stúhin* 'rumble, buzz', *xyxotíty* > *xýxit* 'giggling', *rehotíty* > *réhit* 'hearty laugh, hee-haw', *spóryty(sja)* > *spir* 'dispute; wrangle'.

[25] "Etymological *o* and *e* in closed syllables in South Western Ukrainian changed into *u* > *ü* > *i* in syllables after which a jer was lost, in North Ukrainian into diphthongs". This occurred "by assimilation of *o*, *e* to *ŭ*, *ĭ* in the next syllable, an assimilation which resulted in the narrowing" of the vowels (Kurylo); see G.Y. Shevelov, *A Prehistory of Slavic*, p. 447. The *o* then through a series of diphthongal stages developed into *i*. There are other views on the development of such *i* from *o* in different dialects. An extensive treatment of this question is given by P. Kovaliv in his book *Osnovy formuvannja ukrajins'koji movy* (New York, 1958), pp 59-73. The etymological *e* in syllables after which a back jer was lost, through the stages of labialization and diphthongization, also changed to *i;* when followed by a syllable with ь, it first changed to *ě* the latter giving the reflex *i*. The reflex *i* of the discussed *o* and *e* began to appear in Ukrainian written monuments in XVI c. and in some dialects even earlier. This phonetic process connected with the fall of weak jers was applied by analogy to many other nouns in which *o* and *e* were not followed by a syllable with ъ or ь. Thus many new nouns were built by analogy.

The above alternation also occurs between the following prefixed deriving verbs and derivative suffixless nouns:[26] *dohovorýty(sja)* > *dóhovír* 'agreement', *dozvólyty* > *dózvil* 'permission', *dokorýty* > *dókír* *doxódyty* > *doxód*,[27] 'income', *napojíty* > *napíj* 'beverage', *narostáty* > *nárist* 'excrescence', *nastrojíty* > *nástrij* 'mood', *nedosolýty* > *nedosíl* 'insufficient salting', *obhónyty* > *obhín* 'outdistancing, outstrip', *obkosýty* > *obkís* 'mowing round', *obvódyty* > *óbvid* 'circuit, circumference', *obxódyty* > *obxíd* 'going round, round about way', *perebrodýty* > *perebríd* 'wading through, ford', *perevódyty* > *perevíd* 'transfer', *perevózyty* > *perevíz* 'ferriage; transport', *perehónyty* > *perehín* 'outrunning; overdriving', *perekosýty(sja)* > *perekís* 'bending', *perekópuvaty* > *perekíp* 'cross-ditch, canal', *perekrójuvaty* > *perekríj* 'cutting out again', *peresolýty* > *peresíl* 'excess of salt', *perestójuvaty(sja)* > *perestíj* 'standing too long', *pererostáty* > *pereríst* 'outgrowing', *prokosýty* > *prokís* 'mowing', *perezolýty* > *perezíl* 'exceeding wash in lye', *perexódyty* > *perexíd* 'passage; crossing', *pidvózyty* > *pidvíz* 'supply by transport', *pidhónyty* > *pidhín* 'motive, impulse', *pidxódyty* > *pidxíd* 'approach', *pokrojíty* > *pokríj* 'cut; style', *porostáty* > *pórist* 'verdure', *postójaty* > *postíj* 'quartering, billeting', *pryvózyty* > *pryvíz* 'bringing, import', *pryhónyty* > *pryhín* 'bringing/driving (of the cattle)', *pryrostáty* > *pry'rist* 'growth, increase', *prystrójuvaty* > *prýstrij* 'device; attachment', *pryxódyty* > *pryxíd* 'coming, arrival', *provódyty* > *próvid* 'leadership', *pryhovotýty* > *prýhovir* 'saying, proverb', *pryzvódyty* > *prýzvid* 'guidance', *prorostáty* > *prórist* 'sprouting', *proxódyty* > *proxíd* 'passage', *rozvózyty* > *rózviz* 'transport', *rozvódyty* > *rózvid* 'divorce', *rozhónytysja* > *rozhín* 'running start', *rozdójuvaty* > *rozdíj* 'milking', *rozporóty* > *rózpir* 'thrust', *rozplódyty* > *rózplid* 'stock-breeding', *rozrostátysja* > *rózrist* 'growth, increase', *rozxódytysja* > *rózxid* 'going asunder; expenditure', *skonáty* > *skin* 'death', *sxódyty* > *sxid* 'rise, rising', *suprovódyty* > *súprovid* 'concomitance', *udójuvaty* > *udíj* 'milk yield', *ukosýty* >

[26] If the alternating root vowel *o* is contained in both aspectual forms of the infinitive with no consonant morphonemic alternation exhibited between these forms, only the impf infinitive is given; otherwise only one of the verb forms containing root vowel *o* is given.

[27] Figurative meaning: "income".

ukís 'swath', *uklonýtysja* > *uklín* 'bow, greeting', *ustrojíty* > *ústrij* 'regime, order', *utvorýty* > *útvir* 'creation, product', *vynaxódyty* > *vý-naxid* 'invention', *vvózyty* > *vviz* 'import', *vvódyty* > *vvid* 'input, inlet', *vxódyty* > *vxid* 'entrance', *vyvódyty* > *výuvid* 'leading off; (electr.) bushing', *vyvózyty* > *výviz* 'exportation', *vyhónyty* > *výhin* 'common pasture', *výzvolyty* > *výzvil* 'liberation', *výpotity* > *výpit* 'perspiration', *vý-plodyty* > *výplid* 'fruit', *výslovyty(sja)* > *výsliv* 'expression', *výtvoryty* > *výtvir* 'creation, product', *vyxódyty* > *výxid* 'exit', *výškolyty* > *výškil* 'formation, education', *vidhónyty* > *vidhín* 'driving away (of cattle)', *vidxódyty* > *vidxíd* 'setting off', *zavózyty* > *zavíz* 'delivery', *zakrójuv-aty* > *zakríj* 'cut', *zarostáty* > *zárist* 'vegetation', *zastójuvatysja* > *zastíj* 'standstill, deadlock', *zaxódyty* > *zaxíd* 'stopping (at a place)', *zhónyty* > *zhin* 'driving together (cattle)', *zrostáty* > *zrist* 'stature, size'.

5.2. The above root vowel alternation {*o*~*i*} does not extend to all deverbal masculine nouns. Some retain *o* of the deriving verbal stem whether unprefixed or prefixed. Among unprefixed nouns are: *kop* 'digging', *lov* 'catching, catch', *kovz* 'gliding', *lom* 'breaking; ache', *korč* 'crampt', *losk* 'clap, rumbling', *trosk* 'flogging', *skok* 'jump', *xov* 'breeding'.

Among masculine nouns derived from prefixed verbs the following retain *o* in their root: a) Those whose deriving verb contains combination *-olo-* in the root. Here belong: *spólox* 'alarm' < *spolóxaty, perepolóx* 'alarm, jumble' < *perepolóxaty, nadkól* 'slight split' < *nadkolóty, rozkól* 'split' < *rozkolóty, prokól* 'hole, puncture' < *prokolóty, ukól* 'prick'; injection < *ukolóty, výholos* 'enunciation' < *výholosyty, rózho-los* 'spreading the news' < *rozholosýty, namolót* 'grain output' < *namo-lotýty, obmolót* 'thrashing' < *obmolotýty, umolót* 'yield of grain' < *umolotýty, výmolot* 'thrashed corn' < *výmolotyty, zákolot* 'rebellion' < *zakolotýty.* b) Other nouns retaining *o* of the prefixed derivational verb stems are: *donós* 'denunciation', *nanós* 'alluvium', *perenós*[28] 'transfer', *pidnós* 'tray', *pyrnós*[28] 'offering', *roznós*[28] 'bearing about', *výnos* 'bearing out', *znos* 'wear', *dótork* 'touch', *prýtok* 'touch', *dozór*[28] 'supervision', *náskok*[28] 'rain, inroad', *pídskok* and *pídskik* 'leap, jump', *doxód*[28] 'income', *pryxód*[28] 'credit', *perelóm*[28] 'break', *prolóm*[28] 'gap', *rozlóm* and *rozlám*[28] 'break', *zalóm*[28] 'fold', *výlom*[28] 'break in/out', *upór*[28] 'rest; lug',

pereór 'ploughing again', *rozkóp* 'digging out', *pohróm* 'massacre', *rozhróm* 'utter defeat', *pózov* 'law suit', *prýzov* 'levy', *potóp* 'flood', *póštovx* 'push', *pryjóm* 'reception', *prykóv* 'chain', *prysmókt* 'sticking to', *sxov* 'keeping, storing', *výtop* 'melting out', *výtorh* 'gains; receipts', *zášmorh* 'loop', *zákot* 'top (of boots' etc.), *zarók* and *zarík*[28] 'vow, pledge'.

The lack of the change of *o* of the verbal unprefixed and prefixed derivational bases to *i* in the derived suffixless nouns is not conditioned by the phonological environment of these vowels (or at least the phonological conditioning has never been demonstrated).

In certain rare cases the root vowel alternation *i~o* affects the lexical meaning of the two deverbal masculine suffixless nouns, e.g., *drib* 'small shot' and *drob* 'roll of drum', *nabír* 'assemblage' and *nabór* 'composition (in printing)', *uklín* 'bow' and *uklón* 'declivity'.

5.3. Some noun stems formed from verbal nonsyllabic present or future tense stems with the root morphoneme {#} vocalize {#} to full vowel {i} before zero ending, e.g., *bý-ty, z-vý-ty: b#j-u, bij-#-#* 'battle', *zivj-ú zvij-#-#* 'winding, bend'. Other nouns of this group are those formed from prefixed verbs containing the prefixes: *na-, pid-, pro-, pry-, pere-, roz-, vid-, za-,* and the root *-bij-;* and the prefixes *za-, z-, roz-* in combination with the root *-vij-*.

Verbal root morphonemes {*y, e, #*} alternate with {*i*} in the root of the derived noun. {*y*} occurs in the impf infinitive, {*e*} in the future tense, and {#} in the pf infinitive. The examples include nouns derived from prefixed verbs only, containing prefixes *do-, na-, nedo-, pere-, pid-, u-, vid-, za-, z-* plus the root *-bir-*, e.g., *dóbir-#-#* 'choice' < *dobyráty, dobráty, doberú.* In two examples {*y*} occurs in the impf infinitive, {#} in the future tense stem, and {*i*} in the pf infinitive: *napír* 'pressure', *rózpir* 'thrust'.

5.4. *Other morphophonemic changes in roots.* Vowel {#} of the root of the verb is vocalized to full vowel {*e*} in the root of the noun:

[28] In *Ukrajins'ko-nimec'kyj slovnyk* by Kuzelja and Rudnyc'kyj: *perenís, prynís* and *prynós, roznís, dozír, náskik* and *náskok, doxíd, pryxíd* 'credit' and 'arrival'; *Slovnyk ukrajins'koji movy,* AN URSR: *pryxíd* 'arrival' (only); Kuzelja and Rudnyc'kyj: *perelím, prolím* and *prolóm, rozlím* and *rozlám, výlim* and *výlom, upír;* in Kuzelja-Rudnyc'kyj and in Holoskevyč dictionaries: *zalím* and *zarík* (only).

dómysel-#-# 'conjecture' < *domýs#lytysja, nedómysel* 'thoughtlessness' < *ne domýs#lytysja, pómysel* 'idea', *rózmysel* 'meditation'. {#} of the root of the verb is vocalized to full vowel {*o*} in the root of the noun and affects the loss of the preceding vowel {*i*}: *pidjóm-#-#* 'lift' < *pidij#máty, pryjóm* 'reception', *pidnajóm* 'sublease'. {*y, #*} of the root of the verb alternate with {*o*} in the root of the noun: *posól* 'ambassador' < *posyláty, pos#l-áty, prýzov* 'levy' < *pryzyváty, pryz#v-áty, pózov* 'lawsuit' < *pozyváty, poz#v-áty.*

Vowel alternations in the roots of the nouns carry no grammatical meaning because such meaning is expressed by the flections. These alternations only strengthen the opposition between the nominative/accusative singular and the rest of the cases in the singular and plural.

There are no changes in the boundary of the prefixes and roots of the derivational verbal stems reflected in the derivative nouns.

5.5. *Consonantal changes.* The final root consonants /*l'*/ /*n'*/ /*š*/ /*r'*/ /*pl'*/ of the impf verb before suffixes *-uva-* and *-a-* alternate with /*l*/ /*n*/ /*x*/ /*r*/ /*l*/ before the suffix *-y-* of the pf verb and before the zero ending of the corresponding deverbal suffixless noun, e.g., /*výhul'jaty, vyhúl'uvaty*/ vs. /*výhul*/. The final root consonant /*č*/ of the verb before suffixes *-uva-, -y-* alternates with /*k*/ of the noun before the zero ending, e.g., /*perel'íčuvaty, perel'ičýty*/ vs. /*perél'ik*/, /*skóčyty*/ vs. /*skok*/.[29]

6. *Productivity.* A word is productive when it serves as a model for building new words. The concept of productivity can refer to the whole of the word-formative structure of the word or to any of its components. There are two kinds of productivity in word-building: systemic and empiric. Systemic productivity involves phonological, morphological and lexical-semantic limitations connected with the internal laws of the development of the language. Empiric productivity involves, so to speak, external factors; a new word is formed according to the existing

[29] In the above AN URSR dictionary: *skok, naskók, pidskík* and *pidskók, vídskik;* in the above Kuzelja-Rudnyc'kyj dictionary: *skik* and *skok, náskik* and *náskok, pídskík* and *pídskók;* in Podvesko's dictionary: *pidskók, vidskók.*

model. Systemic productivity is prerequisite of empiric productivity, i.e., systemic limitations directly affect empiric productivity.

As for the formation of deverbal masculine nouns without suffix in contemporary Ukrainian, there are some structural and semantic limitations. Unprefixed verb stems are not active at all in the formation of such nouns. Among prefixed verbs, on the whole stems with thematic vowels *-a-* and *-y-* serve as deriving bases. The other structural types of verbs are not active in the formation of this type of noun. Also inactive are verbs existing only in one aspect — impf or pf. Inactive as well are prefixed verbs of the type *poxodýty, pobíhaty, povozýty* etc. 'to walk for a while', 'to run for a while', 'to drive (to cart, to draw) for some time'. Unfunctional are stems of the verbs containing more than one prefix, e.g., *pererozpodiljáty, pererozpodilýty* 'to redistribute'. Nouns are not formed at all from verbs in which the prefixes *po-, na-* are attached to already existing prefixal stems, e.g., *popryšyváty* 'to sew on', *naskladáty* 'to pile'.

Linguists distinguish five determinations of the productivity of a word: very productive, medially productive, slightly productive, unproductive and dead. Between these two poles — very productive and dead — as we can see, lie three determinative positions, and the bondaries between them are not fixed. Therefore one's opinion regarding the degree of productivity of a word is rather subjective and vacillating.

The type of noun discussed in this article seems to be only slightly productive in contemporary Ukrainian. The stock of already existing nouns is used frequently in the colloquial and artistic languages, but new nouns are seldom built. New formations represent rare occurrences, characteristic of writers and speakers (*zmah, povstrým, vhad, zljak, výtrym, vdij, vriz* and others).[30]

[30] These and some other nouns occur predominantly in the language of the people of Western Ukraine.

Suffixless Nouns in -a Formed from Prefixed Verbs in Modern Ukrainian: Descriptive Analysis

1. So far very little has been said in linguistic and language publications about the above type of morphological word-building in modern Ukrainian. M.P. Ivčenko indicates only that the phenomenon of affixless noun-building exists without even giving an example for the nouns in -a.[1] O. Synjavsk'kyj points out that "from the verbal roots with prefixes and without them nouns in -a are formed" and gives several examples.[2] M.A. Žovtobrjux and B.M. Kulyk devote to the topic of affixless noun-building only two very hort paragraphs. One is titled "Bezafixne tvorennja immenykiv" (Affixless Noun-building), and the other "Tvorennja imennykiv za dopomohoju prefixiv" (Noun-building by Means of Prefixes). Moreover, the second title is contradictory to the contents of the paragraph.[3] Some valuable information regarding the relationship between deverbative suffixless nouns and deverbative nouns with the suffixes -t't (-a) -n'n' (-a) from the lexical-semantic point of view is pro-

[1] M.P. Ivčenko, *Sučasna ukrajins'ka literaturna mova* (Kyjiv: Kyjivs'kyj universytet, 1965), p. 240.

[2] O. Synjavs'kyj, *Normy ukrajins'koji literaturnoji movy,* 3 vyd. (State College, Pa., 1967), p. 115.

[3] M.A. Žovtobrjux, B.M. Kulyk, *Kurs sučasnoji ukrajins'koji movy,* 1 čast., vyd. 3. (Kyjiv, 1965), pp. 261, 263.

vided by Yu. Šerex (G.Y. Shevelov).[4] However, no scientific investigation of the above topic has been made as yet.

This paper attempts to describe the data of such an investigation. On the basis of the material extracted from the vocabulary of the modern Ukrainian language[5] the morphemic composition of the verbs correlative with the nouns is examined, the integration of this composition in the formation of the nouns accompanied by morphophonemic changes is discussed, grammatical categories and the correlation of the stress and lexical-semantic features are given consideration. The limited topic and material enabled me to make its through research analysis.

2. The nouns under discussion are formed from the correlative prefixed verbs and not from the prefixless nouns by adding prefixes to these nouns because in most cases such prefixless nouns do not exist. For instance, the nouns *pozolota*[6] *'guilding', oxorona* 'guard', *vroda* 'beauty', etc. are not formed by adding the prefix po-, o-, and v- to the nouns zolota, xorona, and rada respectively because such nouns do not exist at all. Consequently, these nouns are formed from the corresponding prefixed verbs.

3. *Morphemic composition* of the verbs from which nouns under discussion are formed: roots, suffixes[7], infinitive formant, prefixes.

3.1 *Roots* are nonsyllabic, monosyllabic and disyllabic. Out of the total number of about 152 verbs usually in both aspects there are eight examples with a nonsyllabic root shaped CC[8] in the perfective aspect

[4] Yu. Šerex (= G.Y. Shevelov), *Narys sučasnoji ukrajins'koji literaturnoju movy* (München: NTSh, 1951), pp. 208-209.

[5] The main sources used: Z. Kuzela, J. Rudnyc'kyj, *Ukrajins'ko-nimec'kyj slovnyk* (Leipzig: 1943); H. Holoskevyč, *Pravopysnyi slovnyk,* 8 vyd. (New York: Knyhospilka, 1955). Consulted were: C.H. Andrusyshen, J.N. Krett, *Ukrainian-English Dictionary* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1957); W. Lew, I. Werbjanyj, *Ukrajins'ko-anhlijs'kyj slovnyk* (Nürnberg: Čas, 1948); V.S. Il'jin, K.P. Dorošenko and others, *Ukrajins'ko-rosijs'kyj slovnyk* (Kyjiv: Naukova Dumka, 1965).

[6] All Ukrainian example words in this paper are cited in phonemic transcription except for unstressed vowels *y* and *e* which for technical reasons are transcribed morphophonemically.

[7] That is, stem suffixes which include thematic vowel and prethematic suffixes.

[8] C = consonant, V = vowel, a. = about, ex. = example.

forms, e.g., *pro-zv-á-ty* 'to nickname', *vidi-zv-á-tys'a* 'to speak of', *vý-hr-a-ty* 'to win', etc., and in four imperfective aspect forms, e.g, *u-jm-á-ty* 'to diminish'.

Out of the total of about 256 monosyllabic roots, both aspectual partners included, there are about four CV, i.e., *roz-žý-tys'a* 'to grow rich', *na-žý-tys'a* to make a fortune', *spo-žý-ty* 'to consume' and *pry-šý-ty* 'to sew on', and the rest of them are covered by the shapes CVC, CCVC, CVCC, and CCVCC, e.g., *z-min-ý-ty: z-mín'-uv-a-ty* 'to change', *na-sad-ý-ty: na-sádž-uv-a-ty* 'to put on', (about 45% examples); *vý-plat-y-ty: vy-pláč-uv-a-ty* 'to pay off', (about 36% ex.); *na-movl'-á-ty* 'to instigate', (about 12% ex.); *do-stavl'-á'ty* 'to deliver', (about 5.2% ex.).

In about 18 verbs, i.e., in 36 aspectual forms, the root is disyllabic and may have the shape CVVC (about 75% ex.) or CCVCVC(C) (about 25% ex.). Ten forms of the first shape have a pleophonic -olo- and eight a pleophonic -oro-, e.g., *po-zolot-ý-ty: po-zolóč-uv-a-ty* 'to guild', *o-boron-ý-ty: o-borón'-uv-a-ty* 'to defend', etc. The examples of CCVCVC include: *vy-svobódž-uv-a-ty* 'to liberate', *za-stanovl'-á-tys'a* 'to think over', and others.

3.2 *Suffixes* appearing in the deriving prefixed verbs of both aspectual forms are:

Pf	Ipf
-a-	-a- -uv-a- -av-a-
-y-	-a- -uv-a- -ov-uv-a- -y-
-u- -nu-	-a-

-0- { -a-, -y-, -av-a }

-uv-a- { -uv-a, -ov-uv-a }

In three instances there are no imperfective aspect froms, and the suffixes in the perfective forms ar: -y-, -a- and -uv-a- One aspectual pair has suffixes, i.e., *pek-tý: s-pek-tý,* and the perfective aspect and their imperfective forms have the suffix -a.

3.3 *The infinitive formant* is -ty, sometimes followed by the reflexive particle -s'a, the latter being found only in 12.9% of the total number of verbs, majority of which have the suffixes -y-: -uv-a- in their aspectual pairs. Examples are: *v-tom-ý-tys'a: v-tóml'-uv-a-tys'-a* 'to get tired', *po-s'v'at-ý-ty(s'a): po-s'v'áč-uv'a-ty(s'a) 'to devote (oneself)'.*

3.4 *Prefixes* involved in the formation of verbs from which nouns in -a are formed can appear in the following shapes: C(s-, v-, z-), V(o-, u-), CV(do-, na-, ne-, po-, vy-, za-), VC (ob-), CVC (pid-, roz-, vid-), CCV (pro-, pry), CCVC (pred-), CVCV (pere-, rozi-, vidi-, vido-).[9] These are simple prefixes. Besides, there are compound prefixes shaped CVCV, i.e., dopo- (do+po), nedo- (ne+do), nepo- (ne+po), zapo- (za+po), CCV, i.e., spo- (s+po), zne- (z+ne), CVCVC, i.e., neroz- (ne+roz), perev- (pere+v), CVCVCV, i.e., perevy- (pere+vy), and CVV, i.e., zau- (za+u). Some prefixes occur rather frequently, some not often, and others are found only in isolated examples.

Relatively frequent is the occurence of some CV prefixes (e.g., za-, na-, po-, vy-), some CVC prefixes (e.g., vid-, roz-), most of the C prefixes (e.g., s-, z-) and V prefixes (e.g., o-, u-). Most of the CCV, VC, and CVCV prefixes appear rarely, and the remaining prefixes are found in isolated forms. The frequency of the occurence of the prefixes is determined by the nature of their inherent features as well as by the lexical semantic nature of that part of the verbal stem to which they are attached.

[9] rozi-, vidi- and vido- are phonologically conditioned allomorphs of roz-, vid-.

There is a very limited number of verbs with prefixed perfective and prefixless imperfective aspect forms. Here belong: *s-pokút-uv-a-ty: pokút-uv-a-ty* 'to repent', *s-pek-tý: pek-tý* 'to bake; to scorch', *z-vád-y-tys'a: vád-y-tys'a* 'to quarrel', *za-plat-ý-ty: plat-ý-ty* 'to pay', *za-brod-ý-ty: brod-ý-ty* 'to roam', *za-blud-ý-ty, blud-ý-ty* 'to go astray', *za-brex-á-ty: brex-á-ty* 'to lie', *po-sad-ý-ty: sad-ý-ty* 'to plant', *ne po-vir-y-ty: ne vír-y-ty* 'not to believe', *ne z-rob-ý-ty: ne rob-ý-ty* 'not to do; idle', *ne po-šan-uv-á-ty: ne šan-uv-á-ty* 'to disrespect'. The verbs with the prefixes give rise to the corresponding nouns (e.g. *za-brod-ý-ty: zabróda* 'rambler') except for a few verbs with the negative particle ne. Their creative nouns are formed from the imperfective aspect verbs and the verbal particle ne acquires force of the prefix in these nouns (e.g., *ne rob-y-ty: neroba* 'idler', see 6.).

4. *The integration of the morphemic composition.* Morphemic compostion by itself does not create a new word. Roots, suffixes, infinitive formants, and prefixes cannot be considered as isolated elements artificially existing one beside another in the frame of the word. N.M. Šanskij is right by saying that "Words arise not as a result of a mechanistic composition of the separate meaningful units, the latter being a sort of morphemic blocks, but according to the existent structural patterns of the words and on their basis."[10] These elements, units, are bound together; and this binding is not a mechanistic attachment of one element to another, but it implies their living relationship and living linkage in the process of word-building. For instance, in the noun *pidlýza* 'lick-spittle, toady', there are the following morphemes: prefix pid- with the meaning 'under, sub, ect.' root -lyz-. with the general meaning 'to lick' (cf. lyzáty) and the ending -a. In the corresponding verb *pid-lyz-á-tys'a,* there is the same prefix pid- and the root lyz-. However, indication of the presence of these morphemes in the noun *pidlýza* does not display the way they are bound with one another to form that noun. And this noun is built up not by a mechanistic summing up of the morphemes *pid-lýz-a* but it presents the result of the following linkage:

[10] N.M. Šanskij, *Očerki po russkomu slovoobrazovaniju* (Moscow: Izdatel'stvo Moskovskogo universiteta, 1968), p. 119.

[pid(lyz)]-a. This means that here only the ending -a plays, so to say, an active role in the formation of the noun whereas the other morphemes are inherited from the deriving verb. Besides, the root -lyz- occurs in its unbound form (see later).

This process of the integration in which the verb presents the source and the noun its results generally can be presented this way:

root — suffix — infinitive formant — particle — s'a
prefix (-root — suffix — inf. formant (-s'a), i.e., prefixed-suffixal infinitive

[prefix (root)] ∅ - ∅, i.e., prefixed-sufflixless verbal part
[prefix (root)] ∅ - ∅, i.e., noun stem
[prefix (root)] ∅ - ∅ -a, i.e., noun

Example: rád-y-tys'a 'to consult'
na (-rád-y-tys'a)
[na (rad)] ∅ - ∅
[na (rad)] ∅ - ∅ -a
naráda 'conference'

As we can see, the stem of the noun is identical with the stem of the prefixed verb, from which the suffix, the infinitive formant and the particle -s'a (if any) are dropped. This stem being furnished with the feminizing ending -a[11] presents the nominative singular (Nsg) form of the noun.

4.1 The root as a nonderivative stem of the deriving verbs and derived nouns can appear in its unbound and bound form.

A nonderivative stem is unbound when it can appear both in and out the derivative stems of the cognate words with or without a flection,[12] e.g., *rýb-a* 'fish' *rybák* - 'fisherman'. In general, a nonderivative

[11] This term is taken from M.J. a. Nemirovskij's "Sposoby oboznačenija pola v jazykax mira" in *Pamjati akademika N.Ja. Marra* (Moscow-Leningrad: ANUSSR, 1948), p. 205.

[12] Some linguists call a nonderivative stem in unbound form a stem which can appear in and out the derivative stem, but in the latter case without flection, e.g., N. S. Valgina, D. E. Rosental, M. I. Fomina, V. V. Capukevič *Sovremennyj russkij jazyk* (Moscow: Vysšaja Škola, 1961), p. 120. I am inclined to accept N. M. Šanskij's opinion who does

stem can become bound in three instances: a. When the original deriving word with an unbound stem disappeared from the stock of the cognate words, e.g., *zavyd'* 'envy' in *zavýduvaty* 'to envy' — zavýdnyj 'enviable', *závydky* 'envy'.[13] The word *zavyd'* does not exist in modern Ukrainian, it occurs only in the composition of the derivative stems of the cognates and is bound with one or the other affix (except flection). b. When the existence of the original deriving word with an unbound stem cannot be traced but it appears in the composition of derivative stems of the cognate words at present, e.g., -da- in the words *do-dá-ty* 'to add —*vid-dá-ty* 'to return', *rub-á-ty* 'to hew' — *rub-án'n'-a* 'hewing'. As far as the result is concerned, it is similar to that under a. c. When between the word with a nonderivative stem a substantial semantic divergence developed, e.g., in the words *prys'v'atýty* 'to dedicate' —*prys'v'áta* 'dedication' the nonderivative stem -s'v'at- is bound because there is no semantic correlation between *s'v'atýj* 'saint' and the above two words.

A vast majority (about 86%) of the nonderivative stems of the prefixed-suffixal verbs and their correlative prefixed-suffixless nouns in -a are unbound. These stems very often appear as allomorphs due to the morphophonemic changes in them. (About that see later). Examples:

Perfective	Imperfective	Noun	Meaning
v-trát-y-ty:	v-trač-á-ty:	[v(trát)]a	'loss'
v-tom-ý-ty(s'a):	v-tóml'-uv-a ty(s'a)[14]	[v(tóm)]a	'tiredness'
z-móv-y-tys'a:	z-movl'-á-tys'a:	[z(móv)]a	'conspiration'
po-xval-ý-ty:	po-xval'-á-ty:	[po(xvál)]a	'praise'
za-služ-ý-ty:	za-sluh-óv-uv-a-ty:	[za(slúh)]a	'merit'

The remaining about 14% of the nonderivative stems are bound. Among them about 4% are those whose semantics did not diverge from

not exclude flection from the notion of a nonderivative unbound stem appering out of a derivative stem. (See his book above, p. 131.)

[13] P. Kovaliv, *Lekšyčnyj fond literaturnoji movy kyjivs'koho periodu* X - XIV st. (New York: Shevchenko Scientific Society, 1962), p. 244.

[14] Also v-toml'-a-ty(s'a).

the semantics of the derivative stems in the composition of which they appear. Here belong:

Perfective	Imperfective	Noun	Meaning
za-snuv-á-ty:	za-snóv-uv-a-ty:	(za-snóv)a	'foundation'
do-pomoh-tý:	do-pomah-á-ty:	(do-pomóh)a	'help'
o-brýd-nu-ty:	o-bryd-á-ty:	(o-brýd)a[15]	'aversion'
s-po-núk-a-ty:	s-po-núk-uv-a-ty:	(spo-núk)a	'incentive'
u-jm-ý-ty	u-jm-á-ty:	(ú-jm)a	'diminution'
roz-tríp-a-tys'a:	roz-tríp-uv-a-tys'a:	(roz-tríp)a	'hot-headed person'

The rest, i.e., about 10% of the nonderivative bound stems, are those which lost their semantic correlation with the words containing derivative stems. They are:

Perfective	Imperfective	Noun	Meaning
spo-žý-ty: (cf. žyty 'to live')	spo-žyv-á-ty:	(spo-žýv)a	'consumption'
v-rod-ý-ty: (cf. rod-ý-ty 'to give birth')	v-rož-á-ty:	(v-ród)a	'beauty'
z-láhod-y-ty: (cf. láhod-y-ty 'to mend, repair')	z-láhodž-uv-aty:	(z-láhod)a	'agreement'
za-jav-ý-ty: (cf. jav-ý-tys'a 'to appear')	za-javl'-á-ty:	(za-jáv)a	'declaration'
roz-púk-a-tys'a: (cf. pu[l]k-a-ty 'to burst	roz-púk'uv-a-tys'-a	(roz-púk)a	'despair'
ne roz-váž-y-ty: (cf. vah-á 'scale'	ne roz-važ-á-ty:	(ne-roz-váh)a	'inconsideration'
z-ne-váž-y-ty: (cf. above)	z-ne-važ-á-ty:	(zne-vah)a	'contempt'
za-poruč-ý-ty: (cf. ruk-á 'hand')	za-poruč-á-ty:	[za(po-rúk)]a	'guarantee'

[15] Some words listed in Z. Kuzela's and J. Rusnyc'kyj's dictionary might not be used in Eastern Ukraine.

Perfective	Imperfective	Noun	Meaning
za-u-váž-y-ty: (cf. the above words with the root -vah- (allomorph -važ-)	za-u-váž-uv-a-ty	[za(u-váh)]a	'remark'
pry-šý-ty: (cf. šý-ty 'to sew')	pry-šyv-á-ty:	(prý-šv)a	'shoe uppers'
vidi-zv-á -tys'a (cf. zv-a[1]-ty 'to call')	vid-zyv-á-tys'a	(vidó-zv)a	'proclamation'
s-po-luč-ý-ty: (cf. Old Ukr. lučь[16] 'ray', luča[17] 'sword' and Old Ukr. luč-y-ty[18] 'to split into splinters')	s-po-luč-á-ty:	[s(po-lúk)]a	'compound, union'
z-luč-ý-ty: (cf. similarity with s-po-luč-ý-ty)	ž-luc-ă-ty:	(zlúk)a	'union'
No perfective	*na-solódž-uv-a-tys'a*	(na-solód)a	'enjoyment.

In this group of words there is one word sequence which deserves special attention, namely, *vid-rád-y-ty: vid-rád-ž-uv-a-ty* 'to dissuade': (vid-rad)a 'delight, joy'. There is, as one can see, a total discrepancy between the semantics of the verb and the noun. This entirely different meaning did not develop in the historic period of the Ukrainain language because even in the literary monuments of the XI c. the noun *vidráda* appears in its form *otráda* with the same meaning, i.e., 'joy, delight'.[19] Hence it has a nonderivative stem vidrad- (and not the stem rad- in an unbound form), contrary to the verb in which this stem is derivative. The corresponding noun formed from this verb is vidrádž-uvan-n'a 'dissuasion'.

4.2 In the formation of the verbal nouns discussed there are *mor-*

[16] P. Kovaliv, *Leksyčnyj fond* — (see above), p. 13.

[17] Ibid., p. 322.

[18] Ibid., p. 358.

[19] Ibid., pp. 55, 57.

phophonemic alternations which usually take place at the boundary of the verbal and noun root. It is to be mentioned that we talk about the nominative singular form.

In regard to vowel alternation, there are three nouns showing the alternation between their root vowel -o- and the vowel -a- of the root of the imperfective aspect verb, i.e., *znemÓh-a* 'weakness': *z-ne-mAh-á-ty(s'a) dopomÓh-a* 'help': *do-pomAh-á-ty, zapomÓh-a* 'support': *za-pomAh-á-ty*. In one noun the root vowel -o- alternates with -u- of the perfective verb, i.e., *zasnÓva* 'foundation': *za-snUv-á-ty* and in noun the root vowel -o- of *zapÓna* 'canopy, curtain' alternates with the root vowel -y- and of the imperfective and perfective aspect verb respectively, i.e., *za-pYn-á-ty: za-pn-Ú-ty*. The correlation between the rest of the verbal suffixless parts and the nouns involves the alternation of the final consonant of their stems. This alternation can be as follows:

(1) The final consonant of the stem of the noun being identical with the final consonant of the root of the perfective aspect verb, alternates with the final consonant of the root of the imperfective aspect verb, e.g., *namóVa* 'instigation' — *na-móV-y-ty: na-moVL'-á-ty*. The above mentioned consonant of the perfective aspect appears always before the thematic vowel -y-, whereas the consonant(s) of the imperfective aspect can appear before the thematic vowel -a- or before the prethematic suffix. This type presents the most frequent alternation. It is found in about 70% of examples. Denoting the noun by N, the perfective aspect of Pf and the imperfective aspect by 1pf the alternation can be presented as follows:

NPf	v	b	p	m	n	l	r	d	t	t
1pf	vl'	bl'	pl'	ml'	n'	l'	r'	dž	č	k

The most frequent is the alternation v-vl' (a. 22%), d-dž (about 12%) and t-č (about 11%), whereas p-pl' and t-k are found in isolated forms.

(2) The final consonant of the stem of the noun being identical with the final consonant of the root of the imperfect aspect verb alternates with the final consonant/ or Ø of the perfective aspect verb, e.g., *zaslúH-a* 'merit' — *za-sluH-óv-uv-a-ty: za-sluŽ-ý-ty*.

Nlpf h v
Pf ž Ø

In this small group comprising only 4.6% of the total number of examples one noun has only correlative imperfective verb, i.e., *prýhr-a* 'bee flight': *pry-hr-av-á-ty*

(3) The alternation occurs between the final consonant of the stem of the noun on one side, and the final consonants of the root of the verb of both aspects on the other side, the above final consonants of the verb being identical, except for three verbs which have no perfective aspect, i.e., *roz-moVL'-áty: rozmóV-a* 'conversation', *ne-do-viR'-á-ty: nedoviR-a* 'distrust', and *u-praVL'-á-ty: upráV-a* 'rule':

Pf Ipf č š ž
N k x h

About 12% of the examples including the above three exceptions belong to this group.

(4) The alternation takes place between the final consonant of the stem of the noun, or the whole root of the noun, and the final consonants of the root of the verb, or the whole verbal root, of both aspects, the above final consonants of the verb being different, e.g., *zalóH-a* 'garrison': *za-loŽ-ý-ty: za-KLAD-á-ty*. This group includes about 4% of the examples.

(5) In about 9% of the examples there is no morphophonemic alternation, e.g., *sponúka* 'stimulus': *s-po-núk-a-ty: s-po-núk-uv-a-ty.*

5. *Stress.* In the verbs the stress more often falls on the suffixes than on the root in both aspectual forms, and in the imperfective forms slightly more often than in the perfective forms.

Seven verbs with the stressed prefix vy- in the perfective aspect give rise to the corresponding nouns with unchanged stress, e.g., *vý-služ-y-ty: vý-sluh-a* 'service', *vý-plat-y-ty: vý-plat-a* 'paying off', etc. The verb *perevý-trat-y-ty* is the source of the noun *perevý-trat-a* 'over expenditure'. From two verbs with the stressed prefix vy- the nouns with the stress on the root are formed: *vý-stav-y-ty: vystáva* 'exhibition, show', *vý-xval-y-ty: vyxvála* 'boasting'. There are four verbs with the unstressed prefixes other than vy- from which the nouns with the stress on these

prefixes are formed. They are: *rozi-hr-á-ty: rózhra* 'decisive game', *pro-zv-á-ty: prózva* 'nickname', *pry-šý-ty: prýšva* 'shoe uppers' and *u-jm-ý-ty: újma* 'diminution'. The noun výprava 'correction; sending off, tanning out' may take stress on the prefix or the root, and *poxválá* 'praise' on the ending or the root (in Western Ukraine).

In all the rest of the nouns the stress falls on the root regardless of whether the root or the suffix is stressed in the correlative verb. It is the ending -a in the Nsg form of these nouns that makes the stress fall on the root in the large majority of examples (see exceptions above). This becomes evident from the fact that in similar deverbative suffixless nouns with *zero* ending in the underlying case that stres falls in more than 65% on syllabic prefixes. The stress is fixed in all cases of the singular and plural, i.e., it is identical with the stress of the underlying form.

6. *Grammatical categories.* All *verbs* can appear in the present, past, pluperfect and future tenses. Almost all of them have both aspects except those indicated under *Prefixes* (see 3.4). All verbs can have personal forms in singular and plural of the indicative, imperative (with or without modal words) and subjunctive mood. As for this category of voice, about 74% of the verbs are transitive only, about 12.5% intransitive-reflexive, some of which can also be used as transitive without particle -s'a (see 3.3.), about 11% intransitive non-reflexive, about 2% transitive/intransitive, about 0.4% transitive/intransitive/reflexive/non-reflexive. Regarding the category of gender, it ought to be pointed out that in these verbs, as well as in other verbs, the gender can be considered only as means of agreement with the nouns or pronouns.

6.2 All the nouns discussed have grammatical category of gender, case, and number.

(1) All nouns are inanimate of feminine gender except for three animate nouns of masculine gender, i.e., *zabróda* 'stranger', *zablúda (pryblúda)* 'new comer' and *zavolóka* 'hobo', and eight animate nouns of common gender, i.e., *neróba* 'idler', *pidlýza* 'flatterer', *zabréxa* 'liar', *začépa* 'offensive person', *roz'z'áva* 'gaper', *projáva* 'idler', *roztrípa* 'absent minded person' and *strýha* 'child with a short hair-cut'.

(2) All nouns take the endings of a hard stem feminine noun in -a,

i.e., in the singular they are: A[20] -u, G -y, DL -i, I -oju, V-o; and in the plural: NV -y, A -y (-iv or -o/ in the nouns above), L -ax, D -am, I -amy.

(3) Though the overwhelming majority of these nouns are abstract (see 7.) (and abstract nouns are usually in the singular), a very large number of them can be used in both singular and plural except for the following: *nasýla* 'compulsion', *vróda* 'beauty', *vtóma* 'tiredness', *znevi-'ra* 'despair', *znemóha* 'weakness', *nepošána* 'disrespect', *perevtóma* 'overexertion', *stóma* 'fatigue', *vid'd'áka* 'requital', *nedovíra* 'distrust', and possibly some more. These nouns are used in singular only and it is rather difficult to determine the criterion for such a distinction in usage.

It is certain that their structure cannot serve for such a criterion and their semantics does not seem to have this function either because there is a large number of the remaining nouns which are also abstract, similarly to the above nouns, and can occur both in singular and plural, e.g., *vtráta* 'loss', *zmína* 'change', *zmóva* 'conspiration'.

7. *Lexical-semantic correlation.* Morphemes may have different meanings.[21] However, their integration in the verbs discussed results in the meaning which generally can be described as an action in a broad sense, i.e., in the variety of the processes performed by the agent. The verbal suffixes have lexical-grammatical meaning, but most of the prefixes in contrast to the suffixes have only lexical meaning. And it is interesting here that the dropping of the suffixes results only in the dropping of their grammatical (formative) meaning whereas their lexical meaning is to a great degree transferred to the derived noun. As for the prefixes and roots, they also retain their previous verbal meaning in that noun. Thus, in general, the noun receives the meaning which has a common lexical basis with the meaning of the deriving verb. Yet there is a difference between them in which one can distinguish three types: a. The action of the verb in its durative or completed state becomes a noun

[20] A = accusative, N = nominative, G = genitive, D = dative, L = locative, I = instrumental, V = vocative.

[21] H.A. Gleason, Jr. *An Introduction to Descriptive Linguistics* New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1955), pp. 54-56.

denoting an agent abstraction[22], i.e, the action as such, the action outside of any notion of time. b. The agent abstraction, in addition to its feature under a. appears also as a noun denoting an object, the latter being the result of the action expressed by the verb. c. The abstract noun appears only as a concrete object.

The nouns under a. present the largest group, about 77%. Examples: *zaslúha* 'merit', *zláhoda* 'agreement', *namóva* 'instigation', *poxválá* 'praise', *výsvoboda* 'liberation', *zajáva* 'declaration', *zastanóva* 'consideration', *vidnóva* 'renewal', *nepošána* 'disrespect', *rozpústa* 'dissoluteness', etc.

The type under b. covers the following nouns: *zapláta* 'payment', *zapomóha* 'support', *vypláta* 'paying off', *vypráva* 'correction; dowry', *pryvába* 'allurement', *pidpráva* 'correction', *oxoróna* 'guard', *oboróna* 'defense', *scrípa* 'confirmation; bandage', *upráva* 'leading, administration', *výhra* 'gain; prize', *zaporúka* 'guarantee', *vidózva* 'proclamation' (i.e., official announcement and that which has been announced), *vidznáka* 'distinction; sign', *perevýtrata* 'overexpenditure', *perežkóda* 'obstacle'.

The type c. of the nouns embraces only gramatically concrete objects among which some denote persons and some are inanimate. It is difficult to find out whether these nouns went through the stage b. and whether once there were also their parallel agent abstractions or they present straight derivation from the verbs. Those denoting persons are listed under *Grammatical categories* (see 6.2). The inanimate nouns are: *nasáda* 'base of the nose (peak)', *zavísa* 'curtain; veil', *zastáva* 'gate(s); toll-gate; outpost', *osáda* 'settlement', *opláta* 'payment', *obhoróda* 'enclosure', *pokláža* 'luggage', *zalóha* 'garrison', *zapóna* 'canopy, curtain', *prýšva* 'shoe uppers', and *okrúha* 'district, vicinty'.

In contrast to other types of abstract nouns which normally do not form diminutives (cf. *bezvidpovidál'nis't'* 'irresponsibility', *teplotá* 'heat', etc.) many deverbative prefixal-suffixless nouns can form diminutives with suffix -on'k- in popular usage, e.g., *vtráta* 'loss' — *vtrá't-on'k-a,*

[22] In distinction, e.g., from nouns such as *bezvidpovidal'nis't'* 'irresponsibility', *postupovis't'* 'gradualness', etc., which are qualitative abstractions.

zhóda 'agreement' — *zhód-on'k-a, nadoloda* 'enjoyment' — *na-solod-on'k-a, zmova* 'conspiration' — *zmóv-on'k-a, zastáva* 'gate(s), — *zastav-on'k-a,* etc.

Deverbative abstract nouns with the suffixes -n'n-(a), -t't'-(a) sometimes also may acquire the meaning of the result of the action like deverbative prefixal-suffixless nouns in -a do, but it occurs rather seldom, e.g., *vrážen'n'a* 'impression' denotes the process of perception as well as its result, i.e., that which has been perceived.[23] However, in most instances there is no indication of the meaning between these two types of nouns because as Šerex says "nouns with the suffixes -n'n'(a), -t't'-(a) emphasize more the flowing of the action in time, its duration; and deverbative suffixless nouns with zero ending denote the action more abstractly".[24] The same is true in regard to the deverbative prefixal-suffixless nouns in -a.

8. Conclusions. Deverbative prefixal-suffixless nouns in -a present a relatively small group of nouns in modern Ukrainian (about 152). On the level of their morphological structure, they consist of the root and prefix both being inherited from the correlative verbs, and of the ending -a in the Nsg form. In the word-building process these morphological units, morphemes, are not mechanistically attached to one another, but they are integrated on the basis of the existence or absense of their lexical-semantic correlation. This process is accompanied by morphophonemic alternations which usually occur between the final consonant(s) of the stem of the noun and the final consonant of the root of the verb. The most frequent is the alternation between a hard consonant appearing before the thematic vowel -y- of the perfective aspect verb and retained as a final stem consonant of the noun, on one side, and a palatalized consonant appearing before the thematic vowel -a- or prethematic suffix of the imperfective aspect verb, on the other side.

With several exceptions, the nouns carry the stress on the root,

[23] Yu. Šerex (= G.Y. Shevelov), *Narys sučasnoji ukrajins'koji literaturnoji movy* (München: NTSh, 1951), p. 209.

[24] Ibid., pp. 208-209.

contrary to their correlative verbs in which the stress ore often falls on the suffix.

In regard to grammatical categories, it should be pointed out that the largest number of verbs (about 74%) giving rise to the correlative nouns are transitive. Except for several animate nouns common and masculine genders all the rest of the nouns are of feminine gender. A large number of them can be used in singular and plural, and some of them occur in singular only.

On the lexical-semantic level, most of the nouns are purely abstract, i.e., they denote an action as such, outside of any notion of time, some can be both purely abstract and denoting the result of the action, and some can indicate grammatically concrete objects only.

Suffixless nouns in -a formed from prefixed verbs are unproductive in modern Ukrainian.

Vowel/Zero Alternations in the Nominal System of Contemporary Standard Ukrainian

1. The morphophonemic vocalic alternations in contemporary standard Ukrainian are the results of the phonemic developments of the Ukrainian language and of the historical process known as "analogical levellings". Some alternations are found in the nominal and verbal systems, the other alternations occur only in one of them. Some are represented very productively in certain forms of the parts of speech, but with little or no productivity in other forms. In some forms they are consistent, in other they display greater or smaller degree of inconsistency. It is the purpose of this paper to analyze the vowel/zero alternation in regards to its distribution in substantives, adjectives, pronouns and numerals with the implication of its relationship to the consonantal environment, and to indicate the hierarchy of its productivity and consistency.[1]

[1] The main sources used for the analysis were: H. Holoskevyč, *Pravopysnyj slovnyk,* (8th ed.,; New York, 1955); C.H. Andrusyshen, *Ukrainian-English Dictionary,* (Saskatoon, 1955); Z. Kuzelja and J. Rudnyec'kyj, *Ukrajins'ko-nimec'kyj slovnyk,* (Leipzig, 1943); consulted was J. Šerex (G. Shevel'ov), *Narys sučasnoji ukrajins'koji literaturnoji movy,* (Munich, 1951).

2. THE ALTERNATION OF O/#.

2.1 This alternation is highly productive in polysyllabic fem. subst. with the nom. sg. ending *-a,* # ending in the gen. pl., and the final stem consonant *k* preceded by one or two consonants.[2] (A cluster of three consonants before *k* is found in the noun *horstka* 'handful; small number'.) The alternating *o* appears between *k* and the preceding consonant. Using a symbol C for that consonant, we obtain two formulas for the alternation of o/# in the above group of substantives: (1) COK genl. pl. form/CK all other forms; (2) CCOK gen. pl. form/CCK all other forms. Formula (1) represents about twelve hundred substantatives. A great majority of them are derivative formations that include a large number of diminutives.[3] The illustration below shows which of the hard voiced and voiceless C of formula (1) are found before the final stem consonant *k*.[4]

	+	+	+	+	+	+		+	+	+		+	+	+	*					+	+	+	+	
C	*b*	*p*	*v*	*f*	*d*	*t*	*dz*	*c*	*ž*	*š*	*dž*	*č*	*z*	*s*	*šč*	*g*	*k*	*h*	*x*	*l*	*m*	*n*	*r*	K

As one can see, C does not include *dz, dž, g, k, h* and *x*. In two substantives *šč* before the alternating *o* simplifies to *š* before *k: doščÓk/dóška* 'board', *zmórščOk/zmórška* 'wrinkle'. From the 'soft' voiced and voiceless consonants only *l', n',* very rarely *d', c'* and *z',* and the palatal *j* are represented by C. Examples of formula (1) are: *rýbOk/rýbka* 'fish' (dim.), *klepÓk/klépka* 'staff-wood', *domívOk/domívka* 'house', *karáfOk/karáfka* 'carafe', *hrjadÓk/hrjádka* 'bed', *žátOk/žátka* 'reaping-machine', *dorížOk/dorížka* 'road; way' (dim.), *ptašÓk/ptáška* 'bird' (dim.), *pljašecÓk/pljášečka* 'bottle' (dim.), *motúzOk/motúzka* 'string', *póholosOk/póholoska* 'rumor', *víjalOk/víjalka* 'winnowing-machine', *rámOk/rámka* 'fram' (dim.), *borozénOk/borozénka* 'furrow' (dim.), *dirÓk/dírka* 'hole' (dim.), *burúl'Ok/burúl'ka* 'icicle', *berízon'Ok/berí-*

[2] *k* usually serves as a suffix or as a suffixal component. In the first case, it can be preceded by one or two consonants, in the second case, only by one consonant.

[3] Besides those listed in the dictionaries, one can form, particularly from the stems with the suffix *k,* more diminutives with the suffixes *-ečk*-a, *-en'k*-a, and especially with the suffix *-očk*-a; e.g., *nebížečka* 'dead woman', *nížen'ka* 'foot, leg', *valízočka* 'suitcase'.

[4] + and - above the letters indicate whether or not the consonants occur before *k*.

zon'ka 'birch' (dim.), *réd'Ok/réd'ka* 'radish', *kyc'Ók/kýc'ka* 'cat' (dim.), *kúz'Ók/kúz'ka* 'insect' (dim.), *čájÓk/čájka* 'peewit, gull'. Here belong also isolated diminutives of the "common gender" such as, *syrítka* 'orphan', and a masc. noun *bátjuška*. Formula (2) covers about seventy substantives. All of them are derivatives, and most of them are derived from noun or verbal stems. This formula is restricted to the following consonant clusters represented by CC: *st, nt, rt, nd* and *zd;* e.g., *artýs-tOk/artýstka* 'actress', *dyletántOk/dyletántka* 'she-dilettante', *čvértOk/ čvértka* 'a quarter-litre bottle', *irljándOk/irljándka* 'Irishwoman', *pojíz-dOk/pojízdka* 'journey'.

The alternation o/# in substantives covered by both formulas is consistent. A deviation (which seems to be the only one) is found in the noun *láska* 'grace'/*lask.*

2.2. The alternation o/# takes place in some fem. subst. (with the nom. sg. ending *-a*) whose stem in most instances ends in two consonants, the final being other than *k.* Most of these substantives have non-derivative stems. They are: *búkOv/búkva* 'letter', *víd'Om/víd'ma* 'witch', *drátOv/drátva* 'shoe-thread', *dróxOv/dróxva* 'bustard', *íhOr/ihrá* 'play, game', *kítOv/kitvá* 'anchor, kedge', *korohÓv/korohva* 'banner', *krýxOt/ krýxta* 'crumb', *krókÓv/krókva* 'rafter', *lýnOv/lýnva* 'rope', *páxOv/ paxvá* 'arm-pit', *pidošÓv/pidóšva* 'sole', *píxÓv/píxva* 'vagina', *pláxÓt/ pláxta* 'kind of skirt', *sukOn'/súknja* 'dress'. Here belong also pluralia tantum: *sakÓv/sakvý* 'saddle bag' and *nóčÓv/nóčvy* 'trough, wash-tub'. Nouns with stems of three consonants are: *cerkÓv/cérkva* 'church', *ískOr/ískra* 'sparkle'. One noun has the stem of four consonants: *vé-rstOv* (or verst)/*verstvá* 'verst=3500 feet'.

In several nouns of this group the alternation o/# is optional: *vid-ózOv* or *vidózv/vidózva* 'proclamation', *názOv* or *nazv/názva* 'name', *rýnOv* or *rynv/rýnva* 'drain/rain pipe'. In the noun *ščóhla* 'mast' *o* can be inserted between the two final consonants *(ščóhOl)* or the ending *-iv* after these two consonants can be used instead *(ščóhliv).* The nouns *kúxnja* 'kitchen' and *sósná* 'pine-tree' can have the alternating *o* (i.e., *kúxOn'* and *sósÓn*), or *e* (i.e., *kúxEn'* and *sósEn*).

The alternation o/# in all the substantives above is unproductive and shows a certain degree of inconsistency; cf. *kítOv/kitvá,* but *žertv/*

žértva 'sacrifice'; *pláxÓt*/*pláxta,* but *šaxt*/*šáxta* 'mine, pit'; *lýnOv*/*lýnva,* but *rynv* (or *rýnOv*)/*rýnva; ščóhOl* (or *ščóhliv*)/*ščóhla,* but *kahl*/*kahlá* 'oven-mouth'; *názOv* (or *nazv*)/*názva,* etc.

2.3. The alternation o/# is very productive in polysyllabic masc. subst. with a # ending in the nom. sg. and with the final stem consonant *k* preceded by one, or two consonants. (A cluster of three consonants before *k* is found in the noun *napérstOk* 'thimble'/*napérstka.*) The alternating *o* appears between *k* and the preceding consonant in the nom. sg. of animate substantives, and nom.-acc. sg. of inanimate nouns. Formulas for the alternation would be: (1) COK nom. sg. form/CK all other forms; (2) CCOK nom. sg. form/CCK all other forms. Consonants represented by C of formula (1) coincide with those represented by C of formula (1) for fem. subst. (2.1.), except that the consonant *f* is not found in masc. subst. Examples include: *nahróbOk* 'tombstone'/*nahróbka, polúkipOk* 'rick'/*polúkipka, zaholóvOk* 'title'/*zaholóvku, sadÓk* 'garden, orchard'/*sadká, hurtÓk* 'circle'/*hurtká, pljácOk* 'loaf'/*pljácka, lancjužÓk* 'chain' (dim.)/*lancjužká, zátyšOk* 'quiet place'/*zátyšku, žučÓk* 'beetle' (dim.)/*žučká, zvjazÓk* 'connection'/*zvjazkú, pisÓk* 'sand'/*piskú, provúlOk* 'by-street'/*provúlka, dimÓk* 'house' (dim.)/*dimká, dzvinÓk* 'bell' (dim.)/*dzvinká, ohirÓk* 'cucumber'/*ohirká, sverščÓk* 'cricket'/ *sverščká, bál'Ok* 'beam'/*bál'ka, pen'Ók* 'stump' (dim.)/*pen'ká, pidkýd'Ok* 'foundling'/*pidkýd'ka, holopúc'Ok* 'fig. greenhorn'/*holopúc'ka, buz'Ók* 'stork'/*buz'ká, ókrajOk* 'edge, brink'/*ókrajka.* Formula (1) covers about five hundred seventy substantives. A great majority of them are derived from noun or verbal stems, the first largely overwhelming. Formula (2) represents about eighteen substantives. It includes the following clusters represented by CC: *st, zd, vt;* e.g., *nárostOk* 'suffix'/*nárostka, nedóuzdOk* 'halter'/*nedóuzdka, žovtÓk* 'yolk'/*žovtká.*

The alternation of o/# in substantives represented by both formulas is consistent.

2.4. The alternation o/# is also found in about fifteen masc. subst. with a # ending in the nom. sg. and with a final stem consonant other than *k* preceded by one consonant. All forms are polysyllabic, except *sOn* 'dream'/*snu(a),* and almost all have non-derivative stems. Examples: *búbOn* 'tambourine'/*búbna, víxOt'* 'truss'/*víxtja, (v)ohÓn'* 'fire'/

(v)ohnjú, vúzOl 'knot'/*vuzlá, kíhOt'* 'claw'/*kíhtja, kípot'* 'soot'/*kíptju, klápot'* 'shred, rag'/*kláptja, kúxOl'* 'mug, jug'/*kúxlja, líkOt'* 'elbow'/*líktja, níhOt'* 'nail'/*níhtja, pýpOt'* 'pip'/*pýptja, pózOv* 'lawsuit'/*pózvu, posÓl* 'ambassador'/*poslá, svékOr* 'father-in-law'/*svékra, cúkOr* 'sugar'/*cúkru.* The noun *búsOl* 'stork'/*búsla* is more frequently used with the alternation e/#, i.e., *búsEl'/búslja* (or *búsEl/búsla*). In the compound substantives *velýkden'* 'Easter' and *pereddén*[5] 'eve' *o* is inserted between *k* and *d, d* and *d* respectively in all other forms, i.e., *velýkOdnja, velýkOdnevi,* etc., *peredÓdnja, peredÓdnevi,* etc.

The optional use of the alternation o/# and e/# in the noun *búsOl,* as well as some other examples, in which the same consonantal environment now the alternating *o,* now *e,* now no vowel is used, indicate a lack of consistency in the alternation; cf. *posÓl/poslá,* but *zámysEl* 'project, intention'/*zámyslu; vúzOl/vuzlá,* but *žézl* 'rod; warder'/*žezla; svékOr/svékra,* but *akr* 'acre'/*ákra,* etc.

2.5. Some productivity is shown by the alternation o/# in about sixty polysyllabic neut. substantives with an *-o* ending in the nom. sg., # ending in the gen. pl., and with the final stem consonant *k* preceded by the consonant only.[6] All substantives of this group are derived from noun stems, and most of them are diminutive formations. The alternating *o* appears between the final consonants of the stem in the gen. pl. form. Formula COK gen. pl. form/CK all other forms covers all forms, but involves more limitation with regard to the consonantal environment than the corresponding formulas for fem. and masc. substantives. Only *ž, š, č, t, l, r* and *n'* represented by C are found before *k* and *o;* e.g., *ližOk/ližko* 'bed', *(v)úšOk/(v)úško* 'ear; lug' (dim.), *ližečOk/ližečko* 'bed' (dim.), *kurjátOk/kurjátko* 'chicken', *krisélOk/krisélko* 'chair' (dim.), *vidérOk/vidérko* 'pail' (dim.), *serdén'Ok/serdén'ko* 'darling'.

The alternation o/# in this group of substantives is consistent.

2.6. Unproductive and inconsistent is the o/# alternation in several polysyllabic neut. subst. with the nom. sg. ending *-o* and the final stem consonants *n* and *m.* All of them have non-derivative stems. Here

[5] *peredóden'* is also used.

[6] That is, in affectionate nouns and denominal nouns denoting persons.

belong: *víkOn*/*viknó* 'window', *súkOn*/*suknó* 'cloth', *povísOm*/*povísmo* 'a handful of scutched hemp', *pásOm* (or *pásEm*)/*pásmo* 'strand; yarn', *stéhOn* (or *stéhEn*)/*stehnó* 'thigh, femur', *báhOn* (or *báhniv*)/*bahnó* 'swamp'.

2.7. Formula (1) for fem. and masc. subst. with some limitation, stands for about forty polysyllabic pluralia tantum (ending in *-y* in the nom. case, except for *jasélka* 'crib, manger'), mostly derivatives from verbal and noun stems. The limitation includes some consonants not found before the final stem consonant *k* in these substantives, i.e., *f, c, z, m, d'* and *z'*. Examples: *pómynOk*/*pómynky* 'funeral repast', *hrabél'Ok*/*hrabél'ky* 'rake' (dim.), *pidtjážOk*/*pidtjážky* 'suspenders'.

The alternation is consistent.

2.8. The *o* of the second component of the gen. pl. form of the compound numerals *dvox sOt, tr'ox sOt,* etc., alternates with # in all other forms, e.g., *dvísti* 'two hundred', *trýsta* 'three hundred', etc.

3. THE ALTERNATION E/#.

3.1 This alternation is very numerous in polysyllabic masc. subst. in *-ec'* (*jec'*). The overwhelming majority of them are derivatives from noun, verbal, adjectival or participial stems. The alternating *e* appears between the final stem consonant *-c'* and the preceding consonant in the nom. sg. of animate substantives, and in the nom.-acc. sg. of inanimate nouns. Two formulas represent them: (1) CEC' nom. sg. form/CC' all other forms; (2) CCEC' nom. sg. form/CCC' all other forms. About six hundred ten substantives are represented by formula (1), and about twenty substantives are covered by formula (2). The consonants for which C stands before E in formula (1) are: *b, p, v, d, t, ž, z, s, l, m, n, r, j*. C before C' stands for the same consonants, except that *z, s, l* and *n* become palatalized. Examples: *hrebÉc'* 'rower, oarsman'/*hrebcjá, kupÉc'*, 'merchant'/*kupcjá, vydavÉc'* 'publisher'/*vydavcjá, jidÉc'* 'eater'/*jidcjá, vynuvátEc'* 'culprit'/*vynuvátcja, peremóžEc'* 'winner'/*peremóžcja, abxázEc'* 'Abkhazian'/*abxázcja, litopýsEc'* 'chronicler'/*litopýscja, dobrovólEc'* 'volunteer'/*dobrovól'cja, čužozémEc'* 'foreigner'/*čužozémcja, hamanÉc'* 'purse'/*hamancjá, výborEc'* 'voter'/*výborcja, bojÉc'* 'fighter, warrior'/*bijcjá*. The consonant clusters represented by CC in formula (2) are: *nd,*

rn, rž, rd, zd, ng; e.g., *isljándEc'* 'Icelander'/*isljándcja, hornÉc'* 'pot'/*horncjá, samodéržEc'* 'autocrat'/*samodéržcja, lombárdEc'* 'Lombard'/*lombárdcja, jizdÉc'* 'rider'/*jizdcjá, lotríngEc'* 'Lothrigian'/*lotríngcja.*

In several substantives *e* is retained: *báhréc'* 'purple'/*báhrecjá, hostÉc'* 'rheumatism'/*hostecjá, (i)hréc'* 'apoplexy'/*ihrecjá, mokréc'* 'malanders'/*mokrecjú, mudréc'* 'sage'/*mudrecjá, mertvéc'* 'the dead'/*mertvecjá.* In a few monosyllabic substantives the *e* of the nom. sg. is dropped before *c* in all other forms, but instead, an *e* appears between the first two consonants to form the initial syllable: *žnEc'* 'reaper'/*žnEcjá, žrEc'* 'hist. priest'/*žErcjá, mrEc'* 'the dead'/*mErcjá, švEc'* 'shoe-maker'/*šEvcjá.*

3.11. The alternation e/# in substantives in *-ec',* on one hand, is morphologically determined (as it is in other substantives discussed), on the other hand, it is strongly supported by the distribution of consonant clusters. Usually, if the cluster is permissible, the *e* alternates with #, and if it is impossible, the *e* is retained. From this point of view, one can say, this alternation is consistent.

3.2. The alternation e/# is represented by a fairly large number of substantives in *-en'* (about a hundred twenty), in a relatively small group in *-el'* (about thirty-five), *-er* (about twenty), and *-el* (about fifteen), and in a very limited number of nouns in *-en* (six), *-et* (three) and *-es* (two).

3.21. A relatively fair degree of quantitative alternation e/# is displayed in substantives in *-en'.* With the exception of two monosyllabic forms (i.e., *den'* 'day' and *pen'* 'stump'), they are polysyllabic, and most of them have derivative noun, verbal or adjectival stems. The alternating *e* and the consonant *n* can have one or two preceding consonants. (A cluster of three consonants is found only before *e* in the noun *pérstEn'* 'ring'/*pérsnja.*) Formulas representing this group of substantives are: (1) CEN' nom. sg. form/CN' all other forms; (2) CCEN' nom. sg. form/CCN' all other forms. C before *e* in formula (1) stands for *b, p, d, t, v, z, s, ž, č* and *r.* C before N' stands for the same consonants, except that *z, s* become palatalized. Examples are: *molébEn'* 'church service'/*molébnja, lýpen'* 'July'/*lýpnja, búdEn'* 'week-day'/*búdnja, kvítEn'* 'April'/*kvítnja, rívEn'* 'level'/*rívnja, vjázEn'* 'prizoner'/*vjáznja, véresEn'* 'September'/*véresnja, léžEn'* 'idler'/*léžnja, síčEn'* 'January'/*síčnja, dúrEn'* 'fool'/*dúrnja. E* is retained in the noun *ólen'* 'deer'/*ólenja,*

tjulén' 'seal', sea-calf, sea-dog'/ *tjulénja.* CC before E in formula (2) stand for *st, rt, rž, rš, rv, rd, vd, vt, žd* and *zd.* Seven of them are retained in CCN', and *t, d* of the clusters *st, žd* and *zd* are dropped. Examples: *prýxvostEn'* 'hanger-on'/ *prýxvosnja, perevértEn'* 'wer(e)wolf'-/ *perevértnja, jásen'* 'ash-tree'/ *jásenja* (or *jásen/jásena,* 3.25.), *stéržEn'* 'pivot'/ *stéržnja, šéršEn'* 'hornet'/ *šéršnja, čérvEn'* 'June'/ *čérvnja, námordEn'* 'muzzle'/ *námordnja, pívdEn'* 'south'/ *p/vdnja, žóvtEn'* 'October'-/ *žóvtnja, týždEn'* 'week'/ *týžnja, pídborózdEn'* 'skylark'/ *pídboróznja.*

The alternation represented by both formulas is quite consistent.

3.22. Substantives in *-el'* displaying e/# alternation are polysyllabic, and they usually have non-derivative stems. The alternation is unproductive. The following single or two consonants are found before *e: b, p, d, t, v, f, s, c, s, g, k, h; mb, mp, nd, nz.* Before the final stem consonant *-l'* the same consonants occur, except that *s, z* and *c* become palatalized. Examples include: *korabÉl'* 'ship'/ *korabljá, nípEl'* 'nipple'/ *níplja, strúdEl'* 'swirl'/ *strúdlja, bútEl'* 'large bottle'/ *bútlja, žuravÉl'* 'crane'/ *žuravljá, grýfEl'* 'slate-pencil'/ *grýflja, búsEl'* 'stork'/ *búslja* (also *búsEl/búsla* and *búsOl/búsla*), *šnícEl'* 'veal-steak'/ *šníclja, dýšEl'* 'shaft'/ *dýšlja, mágEl'* 'roller'/ *máglja, níkEl'* 'nickel'/ *níklju, strúhEl'* 'plane'/ *strúhlja; hémbEl'* 'plane'/ *hémblja, štémpEl'* 'stamp'/ *štémplja, róndEl'* 'stew-pan'/ *róndlja, pénzEl'* 'paint-brush'/ *pénzlja.*

This alternation is inconsistent. On one hand, *e* alternates with # in substantives such as *strúdel', bútel', štémpel', mágel',* etc., on the other hand, it is retained in the same consonantal environment in substantives such as, *púdel'* 'poodle'/ *púdelja, kítel'* 'milit. jacket'/ *kítelja, rúmpel'* 'tiller'/ *rúmpelja, flígel'* 'wing; outhouse'/ *flígelja,* etc.

3.23. The alternation e/# in substantives in *-er* is unproductive. They are polysyllabic, and most of them have non-derivative stems. Single consonants *b, p, t* and *f* and consonant clusters *st, jst* and *nd* are found before the alternating *e* and the final *r;* e.g., *bobÉr* 'beaver'/ *bobrá, vépEr* 'wild boar'/ *vépra, vítEr* 'wind'/ *vítru, kúfEr* 'trunk'/ *kúfra, magístEr* 'master'/ *magístra, májstEr* 'master, expert'/ *májstra, cylíndEr* 'cylinder'/ *cylíndra.*

There is much inconsistency in the occurrence of the alternating *e* in this group; cf. *magístEr/magístra, minístEr/minístra,* but *míster*

'Mister'/*místera, filíster* 'Philistine'/*filístera; osetÉr* 'sturgeon', but *metr* 'metre', *litr* 'litre', etc.

3.24. Substantives in *-el* involving e/# alternation are polysyllabic. About half of them have verbal derivative stems, and half are non-derivatives. Before *e* and *l* occur: *t, ž, z, s, r.* One consonant cluster, *rd,* is found in the noun *svérdEl* 'drill'/*svérdla.* Examples: *kotÉl* 'boiler'/ *kotlá* (or *kitlá*), *výžEl* 'trackhound'/*výžla, kozÉl* 'he-goat'/*kozlá, osÉl* 'donkey'/*oslá, orÉl* 'eagle'/*orlá.*

No inconsistency in the alternation is found in this group.

3.25. The alternation e/# in substantives in *-en, -et* and *-es* is unproductive. All of them are polysyllabic, except *pes,* and they usually have non-derivative stems. The following single consonants precede the alternating *e* and the final stem consonants respectively: *r, ž, s, v; b, c, č; p, v;* e.g., *hórEn* (or *hórno*) 'furnace; hearth'/*hórna, rožÉn* 'pike; horn'/ *rožná, xosÉn* 'use'/*xisnú, čóvÉn* 'boat'/*čóvná; xrebÉt* 'spine'; ridge'/ *xrebtá, ócEt* 'vinegar'/*óctu, póčEt* 'suite'/*póčtu; pes* 'dog'/*psa, ovÉs* 'oats'/*vivsá. E* is retained in the noun *jásen/jásena* (3.21.).

In four substantives *e* occurs in the same consonantal environment, but in two of them it alternates with #, and in two it is retained: *térEn* 'blackthorn'/*térnu, dérEn* 'turf'/*dérnu; terén* 'terrain'/*terénu, derén* 'dog-berry'/*derénú.* In the last two substantives retention of the *e* and different stress accompany semantics different from that of the first two substantives.

In general, the alternation of this type of substantives is quite consistent.

3.3. The alternation e/# takes place in polysyllabic fem. subst. in *-nja, -na, -lja, -la, -cja, -ma, -ra* (with # ending in the gen. pl.). The alternating *e* appears in the gen. pl. form before the final stem consonant. This consonant and the *e* can be preceded by one or two consonants.

3.31. Somewhat productive is the alternation e/# in substantives in *-nja.* Most of them are derived from noun or verbal stems, the first being in majority. The alternation can be represented by two formulas: (1) CEN' gen. pl. form/CN' all other forms; (2) CCEN' gen. pl. form/ CCN' all other forms. C before E in formula (1) stands for *v, p, d, t, z, s, j, l, r, x, č, š,* and C before N' covers the same consonants, except that

z, s and *l* become palatalized; e.g., *katívEn'/katívnja* 'torture chamber', *stúpEn'/stúpnja* 'foot', *brédEn'/brédnja* 'idle talk', *ljútEn'/ljútnja* 'lute', *kúzEn'/kúznja* 'smithy', *písÉn'/písnja* 'song', *olíjEn'/olíjnja* 'oil-mill', *jidálEn'/jidál'nja* 'restaurant, cafeteria', *drukárEn'/drukárnja* 'printing-house', *bréxEn'/brexnjá* 'lie', *búločEn'/búločnja* 'bakery', *výšEn'/výšnja* 'cherry(-tree)'. Formula (1) represents about a hundred substantives. CC before E and N' in formula (2) stand for *rx* and *vb* found in the nouns *dóvbEn'/dóvbnja* 'beater' and *povérxEn'/povérxnja* 'surface'.

The alternation represented by both formulas is consistent.

3.32. Formula CEN gen. pl. form/CN all other forms represents unproductive but consistent e/# alternation in fem. subst. in *-na,* a group smaller in number than that in *-nja.* With the exception of the first two examples, all substantives are derivative formations from noun stems. C before E and N stands for *z, s* and *v.* Examples are: *bórozEn/borozná* 'furrow', *vésEn/vesná* 'spring', *popívEn/popívna* 'priest's daughter'.

3.33. In about fifteen substantives in *-lja* the alternation e/# is represented by formula CEL' gen. pl. form./CL' all other forms. The alternation is unproductive. About 60% of the substantives of this group have non-derivative stems. C before E and L' stands for *v, f, b, p, m* and *x;* e.g., *budívEl'/budívlja* 'edifice', *túfEl'/túflja* 'shoe', *hrébEl'/hréblja* 'dam', *k(r)ápEl'/k(r)áplja* 'drop', *zemÉl'/zemljá* 'earth', *káxEl'/káxlja* 'glazed tile'. Here belong also 'pluralia tantum' such as, *hrabÉl'* (or *hrablív*)/*hrablí* 'rake', *váfEl'/váfli* 'waffle' and others.

The alternation in this group appears to be relatively consistent.

3.34. The number of substantives in *-la, -cja, -ma* and *-ra* with the alternation e/# is very limited. They have non-derivative stems. The alternation is unproductive, but quite consistent. Here belong: *mit El/mitlá* 'broom', *ovÉc'/vivcjá* 'sheep', *kúčEm/kúčma* 'fur cap', *makítEr/makítra* 'large pot', and several more.

3.4. The alternation e/# occurs in about a hundred polysyllabic neut. subst.[7] with the nom. sg. ending *-o* or *-e* and a/# ending in the gen.

[7] Monosyllabic are *sklo* 'glass', and *dno* 'bottom'.

pl. form. According to their final stem consonants, they are distributed as follows: -*c*-e (about fifty), -*l*-o (about twenty-four), -*n*-o (about seventeen), -*r*-o (about eight) and -*m*-o (three). The alternating *e* appears in the gen. pl. form before the final stem consonant usually preceded by one consonant.

3.41 About 92% of the substantives in -*c*-e containing the alternation e/# are diminutives. The alternation is quite productive and consistent. In formula CEC' gen. pl. form/CC(C') all other forms, consonants represented by C before E are hard, except *j*. C before C stands for *v, t, s, m, n, r, l'* and *j*, and C before C' includes all the above consonants + *s'* and *n'*; e.g., *derevEc'/derevcé* 'tree' (dim.), *kopýtÉc'/kopýtce* 'hoof' (dim.), *kolisEc'/koliscé* 'wheel' (dim.), *pysemÉc'/pysemcé* 'letter' (dim.), *vikónEc'/vikónce* 'window' (dim.), *vidérEc'/vidérce* 'pail' (dim.), *dzérkalEc'/dzérkal'ce* 'mirror' (dim.), *jajÉc'/jajcé* 'egg'. The nouns *vesél'ce* 'oar' (dim.) and *sónce* 'sun' admit also the ending *-iv (vesél'civ, sónciv)* instead of the alternating *e (vesélEc', sónEc')*.

3.42. In the substantives in -*l*-o, of which about 82% are non-derivatives, C of formula CEL gen. pl. form/Cl all other forms represents the following consonants before E and L: *b, p, d, t, r, s;* e.g., *zhré-bEl/zhréblo* 'curry-comb', *dúpEl/dupló* 'hollow', *povýdEl/povýdlo* 'fruit paste', *týtEl/týtlo* 'title of abbr.', *bérEl/bérlo* 'sceptre', *vésEl/vesló* 'oar'. A cluster *sk* is found in the noun *skEl/sklo* 'glass'.

3.43. C of formula CEN gen. pl. form/CN all other forms in the substantives in -*n*-o, of which about 65% have non-derivative stems, represents the following consonants before *e* and *n: z, s, d, t, h, l, r, j;* e.g., *blézEn/bléznó* 'defect in the cloth', *krósEn/krósno* 'weaver's loom', *dEn/dno* 'bottom', *polótEn/polotnó* 'linen', *stéhEn* (or *stéhOn,* 2.6.)/ *stehnó* 'thigh', *batožýlEn/batožýlno* 'whip-handle', *zérEn/zérno* 'grain', *kléjEn/klejnó* 'brand'.

3.44. All substantives in -*r*-o with the alternation e/# are non-derivatives. C of formula CER gen. pl. form/CR all other forms represents *b, d, t;* e.g., *rébEr/rebró* 'rib', *vídEr/vidró* 'pail', *xút(E)r/xútro* 'fur'. Two consonant clusters, *st* and *zd,* occur before the final *r: lju[1]-stEr/ljústro* 'mirror', *nízdEr* (or *nízdriv*)/*nízdro* 'nostril'.

3.45. The alternating e/# in the substantives under 3.42., 3.43.,

3.44. and 3.45. is unproductive and involves a considerable degree of inconsistency; cf. *bérEl/bérlo,* but *hyrl* (or *hýrliv)/hýrlo* 'outfall', *batožý-lEn/batožýlno,* but *púžaln/púžalno* 'whip-handle', *vídEr/vidró,* but *nadr/nádro* 'busom', etc.

3.47. The alternating e/# is unproductive, but quite consistent, in some 'pluralia tantum', e.g., *drivÉc'/drivcjá* 'fire-wood', *húsEl/húsla* 'psaltery', *žórEn/žórna* 'millstone'.

3.5. The alternating *e* is found unproductively in the nom. sg. of the following short adjectives: *výnEn* 'owing'/*výnna, výnne; hódEn* 'am, are, is able'/*hódna, hódne; HospódEn'* 'Lord's'/*Hospódnja, Hospódnje; dývEn* 'odd; wonderful'/*dývna, dývne; zhódEn* 'agree'/*zhódna, zhódne; ladÉn* 'ready, prepared'/*ladná, ladné; pévEn* 'sure'/*pévna, pévne; póvEn* 'full, total'/*póvna, póvne; povýnEn* 'should, must'/*povýnna, povýnne; jásEn* 'clear'/*jásna, jásne.* This alternation is consistent. It is phonologically determined. The alternating *e* is inserted between the consonants *bn, dn, sn,* etc., because these clusters are impermissible at the end of a word.

3.6. Only a few pronouns display the alternation e/#. They are: *kóžEn* 'everybody'/*kóžna, kóžne; žádEn* 'none, no one'/*žádna, žádne; ves'* (or *vves', uves'*) 'all, the whole'/*vsja* (or *usjá*), *vse* (or *usé*), *vsi* (or *usí*), *vs'óho, vsijéje,* etc.,; *mEné* 'of me', *mEní* 'to me', *mEné* 'me', *(pry) mEní/mnóju.*

4. THE ALTERNATION I/#.

4.1. This alternation occurs in the numeral *vísIm* 'eight'. Vowel *i* of the second syllable of the nom. (-acc.) form alternates with # in all other forms (*vos'mý* or *vis'móx,* etc.).

5. THE ALTERNATION Y/#.

5.1. This alternation is found in the numeral *odÝn* 'one'. The alternating *y* appears in the nom. (-acc.) case of the masc. form; *odÝn/odná, odné* (or *odnó*), *odnóhó, odnijéji,* etc.

6. Common features of vowel/zero alternation in the nominal sys-

tem of contemporary standard Ukrainian are: (1) The alternating vowels appear between the final and preceding consonants of the stem in the forms with a # ending. (2) The alternation are more productive and in general more consistent in nouns with derivative stems (2.1., 2.3., 2.5., 2.7., 3.1., 3.21., 3.31., 3.32., 3.41.) than in nouns with non-derivative stems (2.2, 2.4., 2.6., 3.25., 3.33., 3.34., 3.42. - 3.45., 3.47.). (3) In the environment of two consonants at the end of the stem, the alternations are more productive than in the environment of three or more consonants in that position. (4) All alternations are morphologically determined, except for the alternation e/# in short adjectives in *-en,* in which it is determined by phonology. (5) No alternation carries a grammatical meaning, because such meaning is expressed by the flections; the alternations discussed, only strengthen the opposition of cases, numbers and cases, genders, genders and cases, or genders, numbers and cases.

Differences involved in the vowel/zero alternations consist mainly in the existence of different quantities of forms with these alternations as a result of their productivity or unproductivity in the past and present.

English Loanwords in Modern Ukrainian

1. There is no langugage entirely free of foreign words because no nation as a carrier and creator of a language lives an entirely isolated life. Economic, political and cultural relationships among nations, together with the social character of human speech and historical facts determining the development of the society inevitably involve linguistig borrowings[1] from one language to another. This process is particularly apparent in vocabulary. The need to designate new things, persons, places, and concepts is a universal cause of lexical innovation. Using ready-made designations is more economical than describing things afresh.[2]

In modern Ukraine there are about 24,000 foreign words, approximately 12 percent of the total quantity of its vocabulary. They have entered Ukrainian at various times from various languages in various meanings. Some loanwords are not numerous, e.g. those from

[1] The term "borrowing" or "loanword"when associated with the meaning of "to borrow" or "to loan" might seem to be inappropriate because he who borrows something from somebody is expected to return what he borrowed and he who granted a loan to sombody may require it back; otherwise the creditor will suffer loss and the debtor will gain, which is not the case when we use these terms in linguistics. The language from which a word was "borrowed" by another language does not lose that word, it continues to use it; and the language recipient may enrich its lexical stock. Thus the terms "borrowing" or "loanword" in linguistic discussion are dissociated from their popular meaning and are unambiguous. In this article both terms are used with the same meaning. See Haugen, Einar: Analysis of Linguistic Borrowing, *Language*, XXVI, 211-214.

[2] Weinreich, Uriel: *Languages in Contact,* 8th edn., The Hague-Paris 1974, pp. 56-57.

Spanish, Dutch, Rumanian and the Turkic languages; some are isolated, e.g. from Portuguese and Arabic, and some from numerous groups. The largest group is represented by Greek and Latin loanwords. Among the living languages German and French are the largest contributors of such words. English loanwords form a relatively large group but much smaller than German and French.

The purpose of this paper is to describe the English contribution to the vocabulary of Modern Ukraine. The investigation encompasses the corpus of English loanwords, various methods of their integration into Ukrainian, their phonological and morphological adaptations, stress and their lexical categories according to various aspects of life of the Ukrainian people. Up to now, this area of investigation has hardly been touched;[3] therefore we cannot present an exhaustive examination of all the specific points related to the topic of this article. Some points in need of further investigation will be pointed out.

It is impossible to determine whether an English word has passed into Ukrainian directly or through an intermediary language. In some cases the lack of certainty in this respect is caused by the fact that more than 80 percent of the English vocabulary is composed of foreign words, especially of Latin, Greek, French, Italian, and Germanic provenience. Therefore, we shall not treat English loanwords from the standpoint of their original etymology but from the standpoint that in their English form they became the vehicle by means of which England (and Amer-

[3] Only the last of these aspects has been given attention by Prof. Watson Kirkonnel in his paper "Common English Loanwords in East European Languages", *Slavistica*, No. 14, 1952. There he lists 143 English common words found in the languages of the East European peoples and gives some sporadic comments on some words. Another philologist, Ju. O. Žluktenko, in his monograph *Ukrajins'ko-anhlijs'ki mižmovni vidnosyny,* Kyjiv 1964, describes language interference among Ukrainian immigrants in Canada and the U.S. On the basis of some examples extracted from several newspapers and conversations he lists 950 "anglicisms" in the dialectal language of the immigrants. However, about 85 percent of these "anglicisms" have Ukrainian literary equivalents and the immigrants who have a good knowledge of Ukrainian do not use these "anglicisms". Moreover, these "anglisisms" very often are used through negligence or intentionally to color conversational language with fun. They are not part of the Ukrainian literary language.

ica) communicated its ideas and objects in various spheres of its culture to Ukraine.

Contact between the Ukrainian language and English was slight. Histories of the Ukrainian language have not treated this topic at all. At this point we can only assume that in view of the fact that France and Germany are territorially closer to Ukraine than England, and that historical and cultural relationships between Ukraine and Germany and France were always more active than with England, it is justifiable to consider French and German the main possible intermediaries of English loanwords into Ukrainian. For this reason in the list of English loanwords following the introduction corresponding French and German forms are also given.

English loanwords began to appear in Ukraine mainly in the 19th and 20th centuries. The historical aspect of this point needs further investigation.

Here another question arises: Was it Ukraine that first adopted the English words or was it Russia? The answer remains and probably will continue to remain a matter of speculation. After Ukraine lost its independence in the 18th century and became part of the Russian empire, both the Ukrainian and Russian languages were equally exposed to the West European cultural influences, and subsequently to the influence of French, German and English. Thus, English loanwords (some directly and most through French and German mediation) could reach Ukraine first and then migrate to Russia, or vice versa; or they could reach both countries simultaneously.

The main sources of English loanwords in Ukrainian were the dictionaries of Mel'nyčuk and Orel (see Note 4). In the former are listed about 645 English loanwords; in Orel's dictionary there are about 200 fewer. This is because, as Orel himself states, his dictionary does not include many new loanwords, especially in the natural sciences.[4]

[4] Sources used: Mel'nyčuk, O.S.: *Slovnyk inšomovnyx sliv,* Kyjiv 1974; Orel, Artem: *Slovnyk čužomovnyx sliv,* New York, 1963-1966; An U.R.S.R.: *Slovnyk ukrajinsk'koji movy,* Kyjiv 1970-80, 11 vols; Hrinčenko, B.: *Slovar' ukrainskogo jazyka,* Kyjiv 1958-59. Consulted were: Ilarion, mytropolyt: *Etymolohično-semantyčnyj slovnyk ukrajinsk'koji*

The largest groups of loanwords pertain to sport, nautical terminology and technology; smaller groups contain vocabulary of other cultural categories. Below are listed loanwords according to these groups supplemented be a list of miscellaneous loans. The author does not claim that this list is exhaustive.

2. English loanwords according to their cultural fields[5]

(1) **Aviation**: báftyng 'buffeting'; *fljáter* 'flutter'; F. flotter, G. flattern; *propéller* 'propeller'; F. propulseur, G. Propeller; *stjuardésa 'stewardess'; F. stewardess, G. Stewardess.*

(2) **Aviculture:** *brójlery* 'broilers'; *brúderhauz* 'brooder + house'.

(3)**Amusements:** *bándžo* 'banjo'; F. banjo, G. Banjo; the Ukrainian (dž) points to English as the direct source; *bitlz* 'beatles'; *bljuz* 'blues', F. blues, G. Blues; *brydž* 'bridge', F. bridge, G. Bridge; *džaz, džaz-bánd* 'jazz, jazz-band', F. jazz, G. Jazz; the (dž) points to Eng. or G. as direct source; *džóker* 'joker' (card in card games), F. joker, G. Joker; (dž) points to Eng. and G.; *flirt* 'flirt, flirting'; *fokstrót* 'fox trot'; F. fox-trot, G. Foxtrot (dance); *kljub* 'club, clubhouse'; F. club, G. Klub; *krosvórd*

movy. Winnipeg 1979-82, 2 vols. (A-L); Rudnyc'kyj, J.B.: *An Etymological Dictionary of the Ukrainian Language,* Winnipeg 1962-77, first 16 parts; Horbač, Oleksa: *Peršyj rukopysnyj ukrajnisk'ko-latynsk'kyj slovnyk Arseninja Korec'koho-Satanovs'koho ta Jepifanija Slavynec'koho,* Rym 1968. For orthography of Ukrainian was used: Holoskevyč, H.: *Pravopysnyj slovnyk,* New York 1955, 8th edn. For Ukrainian-English vocabulary was used: Podvez'ko, M.L.: *Ukrajinsk'ko-anhlijs'kyj slovnyk,* 1954. For English-Ukrainian served: Podvez'ko, M.L., Balla, M.I.: *Anhlo-ukrajinsk'kyi slovnyk,* Kyjiv 1974. The following works were the chief sources for English, French and German: *Merriam-Webster, New International Dictionary, 1976; Ed. Mansion,* J.E.: *Heath's Standard French and English Dictionary,* Part 1 French-English, Part II English-French, Boston 1961; Messinger, Heinz: *Langenschedts Grosswörterbuch,* Berlin-Munchen 1972; Kluge, F.: *Etymologisches Worterbuch der deutschen Sprache,* Berlin 1957, 17th edn.

[5] Abbreviations: agr. — agriculture; cer. — ceramics; ch. — chemistry; cont., — container; el. — electrical; f. — feminine; F. — French; G. — German, m. — masculine; mach. — machine; mech. — mechanic — med. — medicine; min. — mineral; mng. — mining; mtl. — metallurgy; mus. — music(al); n. — neuter; phs. — physics; pl. — plural; psh. — psychology; r. — relates; rad. — radiol; rel. — religion; rlw. — railway; tlph. — telphone; txt. — textile. Proper names are not included in this list. The transliteration of Cyrillic is international

'crossword'; *mjúzyk-hol* 'music-hall'; F. music-hall; *mjúzykl* 'musical composition'; *póker* 'poker'; F. poker, G. Poker; *regtájm* 'ragtime'; *rok-n-ról* 'rock and roll' (dance); *sketč* 'sketch'; F. sketch, G. Sketch; *tustép* 'two-step' (dance); *šejk* 'shake' (dance); *šov* 'show'; G. Schau; *vánstep* 'one-step'.

(4) **Botany:** *blék-rot* 'black rot'; *gutapérča* 'gutapercha'; F. gutta-percha, G. Gutta percha; *džut* 'jute'; F. Jute, G. Jute; *mángry* 'mangrove'; G. Mangrovenpflanze; *miksbórder* 'mixborder'; *pačuli* 'patchouli'; F. patchouli; *rajgrás* 'rye grass'; *sasafrás* 'sassafras'; F. sassafras, G. Sassafras, *senega* 'senega'; *skreb, skrub* 'scrub'; *turneps* 'turnips'; F. turnep; *vilt* 'wilt-to-fade' (plant disease).

(5) **Clothing:** *brydži* 'breeches'; *džemper* 'jumper'; F. jumper, G. Jumper; *džerzi* 'jersey'; F. jersey, G. Jersey; *makintóš* 'mackintosh'; F. makintosh, G. Mackintosh; *pižama* 'pyjama'; F. pyjama, G. Pyjama; *pled* 'plaid'; F. plaid, G. Plaid; *pulóver* 'pull-over'; F. pull-over, G. Pullover; *redyngót* 'riding coat'; F. redingote corresponds to Eng. 'riding coat', thus Eng. 'redingote' is a back borrowing from F., G. Redingote; *reglján* 'raglan'; F. raglan, G. Raglon; *svéter* 'sweater'; F. sweater, G. Sweather; *smóking* 'smoking jacket'; F. smoking, G. Smoking; *šorty* from Eng. 'short pants'; *vaterprúf* 'waterproof' (fabric, suit, raincoat etc.); *vel'vét* 'velvet'.

(6) **Economics and commerce:** *avtsájdery* 'outsiders' (stock market non-professional speculators); *bestséler* 'best seller'; G. Bestseller; *biznes* 'business'; *biznesmén* 'businesman'; *bojkót* 'boycott; F. boycottage, G. Boykott; *bojkotuváty* 'to boycott'; F. boycotter, G. boykottieren; *bróker* 'broker'; *bum* 'boom'; F. boom, G. Boom; *démping* 'dumping'; F. dumping, G. Dumping; *dyskónt* 'discount'; possibly from G. Diskont; *éksport* 'export'; possibly from G. Export; *import* 'import'; possibly from G. Import; *kliryng* 'clearing'; *kopihól'd* 'copyhold'; *kopihól'dery* 'copyholders'; *kórner* 'corner' (buying deficit goods); G. Korner; *krópery* 'cropers'; *krosbrýdyng* 'cross-breading'; *lizhól'dery* 'leaseholders'; *lokávt* 'lockout'; F. lock-out; *márketyng* 'marketing'; G. Marketing; *prospéryti* 'prosperity'; F. prospérité, G. Prosperität; *pul* 'pool'; *ryng* 'ring'; (for corner market); possibly from G. Ring; *skeb* 'scab'; *svityng, svéjtyna* 'sweating system'; *trávelersček* 'traveller's check'; G. Travellerscheck;

tred-junión 'trade-union'; *tred-jun'jonizm* 'trade-unionism'; *trend* 'trend'; G. Trend; *trest* 'trust'; F. trust, G. Trust; *vól'strit* 'Wall-Street' (stock market place).

(7) **Finance:***banknót* 'bank note'; G. Banknote; *cent* 'cent'; *ček* 'check'; F. cheque, G. Scheck; Ukrainian (č) coincides with the Eng. ((ch); *dajm* 'dime'; *dólar* 'dolar'; G. Taler; *funt sterlingiv* 'pound sterling'; *pénni* 'penny'; *pens* 'pence'; *soverén* 'sovereign' (golden coin); *šýling* 'shilling' F. shilling, G. Schilling.

(8) **Measures:** *bárel'* 'barrel'; F. baril; a2b*ušel* 'bushel'; G. Buschel; *galjón* 'gallon'; F. gallon, G. Gallone; *centál* 'cental'; *fut* 'foot'; *jard* 'yard'; F. yard, G. Yard.

(9) **Food and drink:** *bekón* 'bacon'; F. bacon; *bifšteks* 'beefsteaks'; F. bifteck, G. Beefsteak; *čypsy* 'chips'; *džem* 'jam'; *džyn* 'gin'; G. Gin; *el'* 'ale'; F. ale. G. Ale; *gréjpfrut* 'grapefruit'; F. grape-fruit, G. Grapefruit; *grog* 'grog'; F. grog, G. Grog; *keks* 'cakes'; G. Keks; *kóka-kóla* 'coca-cola'; *koktéjl'* 'cocktail'; F. cocktail, G. Coktail; *kréker* 'cracker'; *lenč* 'lunch'; F. lunch, G. Lunch; *ljard* 'lard'; *liver* 'liver'; *pórter* 'porter'; (ale); F. porter, G. Porter; *púdyng* 'pudding'; F. pudding, G. Pudding; *punš* 'punch'; F. punch, G. Punsch; *rom* 'rum'; G. Rum; *róstbif* 'roast beef'; *sandvič* 'sandwich'; F. sandwich, G. Sandwich; *tost* 'toast'; F. toast, G. Toast; *viski* 'whiskey'; F. whiskey, G. Whiskey.

(10) **Sport:** *avtsájdery* 'outsiders' (sportsmen occupying last seats at the game); *aperkát* 'upper-cut'; F. upper-cut, G. Uppercut; *avt* 'out'; *basketból* 'basket ball'; *baterfljáj* 'butterfly' (swimming style); *bejzból* 'base ball'; F. base-ball, G. Baseball; *bek* 'back'; *békhend* 'backhand'; *bóbslej* 'bobsleigh'; G. Bob (slegh); *boks* 'box'; probably from Latin 'boxum'; *boksér* 'boxer'; F. boxeur, G. Boxer; *čempión* 'champion'; F. champion'; *džeb* 'jab' (in boxing); *džolt* 'jolt' (in boxing); *drajv* 'drive' (in tennis); G. Drive; *drýbling* 'dribbling' (football); F. dribbling, G. Dribbling; *drýbler* 'dribbler'; F. dribbleur (football); *džokéj* 'jockey'; F. jocky, G. Jockey; *finiš* 'finish'; G. Finish; *fljájer* 'flier' (horse race); *fol* 'foul'; G. Foul; *fórhend* 'forehand (in tennis); G. Vorhand; *fórsyng* 'forcing' (in boxing); *fútból* 'football'; *handykáp* 'handicap'; F. handicap, G. Handikap; *gejm* 'game'; *hit* 'heat' (horse race); *gol* 'goal' (in sport); *hókej* 'hockey'; F. hockey, G. Hockey; *hefbék* 'halfback'; *hóldyng* 'holding' (in

boxing);*infájtyng* 'infighting' (in boxing); G. Infight; *jaxt-klúb* 'yacht-club'; G. Jacht+Eng. club; *kártyng* 'carting'; *kiks* 'kicks' (in billiards); *klinč* 'clinch' (in boxing); G. Clinch; *kort* 'court'; *kórner* 'corner' (in soccer); *kravč* 'crouch'; *krokét* 'crouquet'; F. croquet, G. Krocket; *krol'* 'crawl' (swimming style); *kros* 'cross' (running; boxing); *lájnsmen* 'linesman' (in football); *nokávt* 'knock-out'; *nokdávn* 'knock-down'; *ofsájd* 'off side'; *pas* 'pass'; F. passe, G. pass (=den Ball abspielen); *penál'ti* 'penalty' (soccer); F. penalité; *ping-póng* 'ping-pong'; F. ping-pong, G. Pingpong; *pólo* 'polo'; F. polo, G. polo; *pušból* 'push-ball'; G. Pushball; *régbi* 'rugby' (in football); F. rugby, G. Rugby; *rekórd,* 'record'; G. Rekord; *resling* 'wrestling'; *róker* 'rocker' (skating); F. rocker; *server* 'server' (in tennis); *syngl* 'single' (in tennis); *skif* 'skiff'; F. esquif, G. Skiff, *slajd* 'slide'; *smeš* 'smash' (in tennis); *sport* 'sport'; F. sport, G. Sport; *sprynt* 'sprint'; G. Sprint; *sprýnter* 'sprinter'; G. Sprinter; *spurt* 'spurt'; G. Spurt; *stájer* 'stayer'; F. stayer; *start* 'start'; F. start, G. Start; *stýplčez* 'steeplechase'; F. steeple-chase, G. Steeplechase; *šyngárdy* 'shin-guardčs'; *ténis* 'tennis, G. Tennis; *tobogán* 'toboggan'; G. Toboggan; *trek* 'track'; F. trac; *trenáž* from Eng. 'strain'; *tréner* 'trainer'; G. Trainer; *tréning* 'training'; G. Training; *trenuváty* 'to train'; *vaterpólo* 'water-polo'; F. water-polo; *volejból* 'volley-ball'; F. volee-balle, G. Volley-ball.

(11) **Nautical terminology:** *avtbórt* 'ootboard'; *avtrýger* 'outringger' (boat); F. outrigger, G. Outrigger; *barátria* 'barratry'; F. baraterie, G. Barraterie; *bims,* 'beam'; possibly from Duch 'boot'; G. Boot; *bótdek* 'boat deck'; *brekváter* 'breakwater'; *btýdel'* 'bridle', 'span'; *bridždek* bridge-deck'; *čyksy* 'cheeks'; sidepieces'; *dédvejt* 'dead weight'; *déjdvud* 'deadwood'; *dek* 'deck'; G. Deck; *diptank* 'deep tank'; *dok* 'dock'; F. dock, G. Dock; *dóker* 'docker'; F. docker; *drága* 'drag'; F. drague, G. Dragge; *drednóvt* 'dreadnaught'; F. dreadnought, G. Dreadnought; *drifter* 'drifter', 'drift boat'; G. Drifter; *flortýmbers* floortimbers'; *fórpik* 'forepeak'; *gička, gig* 'gig'; *hačbót* 'hatch-boat'; *harpún* 'harpoon'; F. harpon, G. Harpune, Dutch harpoen; *hél'mport* 'helmport'; *káter* 'cutter, 'PT-boat'; F. cutter and cotre, G. Kutter; *keč* 'ketch'; F. ketch, G. Ketsch; *kil'* 'keel'; possibly from Dutch kiel or G. Kiel; *kil'blók* 'keelblock'; *kil'son* 'keelson'; *kingstón* 'kingston valve'; *kliper* 'clipper'; F.

clipper, G. Klipper; *koferdám,* cofferdam'; F. cofferdam, Dutch kofferdam; *kókpit* 'cokpit'; F. cockpit, G. Cockpit; *kómingsy* 'coamings'; F. coaming; *kréngel's* 'cringles'; *kvarterdék* 'quarter-deck'; *lag* 'log' from Dutch log; F. loch, G. Log, Logge; *lájner* (ocean) 'liner'; *lóverdek* 'lower deck'; *mičman* 'petty officer' (Soviet navy), 'ensign' (czarist navy) from 'midshipman'; *monitór;* 'monitor'; F. monitor, G. Monitor; *ótertral* 'otter trawl'; F. otter + Eng. trawl; *pilers* 'pillers', 'stanchion'; F. pilier; *pirs* 'piers'; G. Pier; *pártners* 'partners'; *pljanšýr* 'planksheer'; *port* 'port, port-hole'; *réjder* 'raider'; *ryf* 'reef'; possibly from Dutch rif; *rúderpis* 'rudderpiece'; *rúderpost* 'rudder-post'; *séjner* 'seiner'; *skif* 'skiff; *skúter* 'scooter'; *slip* (rel. to ships) 'slip'; *spinaker* 'spinnaker'; F. spinnaker, G. Spinnaker; *sternpóst* 'sternpost'; *steps* 'steps'; *styvidór* 'stevedore'; *strýnger* 'stringer'; G. Stringer; *strop* 'strop. strap'; G. Stropp; *stjúard* 'steward'; F. steward, G. Steward; *superkárgo* 'supecargo'; F. subrécargue, G. Superkargo; *šel'f* 'shelf' G. Schelf; *šel'terdék* 'shelterdeck'; *šyrstrék* 'sheer strake'; *šxúna, skúna* 'schooner'; F. schooner, G. Schoner'; *tajmčarter* 'time charter'; *tánker* 'tanker'; G. Tanker; *ténder* 'temder'; F. tender, G. Tender; *topsel'* 'topsail'; possibly from Dutch topzejl; *tóptymbers* 'toptimbers'; *tral* 'trawl'; *tramp* 'tramp' (freight ship); G. Tramp; *tránec'* 'transom'; *trávler* 'trawler'; *trýsel'* 'trysail'; *tvindék* 'tween-deck'; *vaterlinija* 'waterline'; possibly from Dutch waterlijn; *vátervejs* 'waterways'; *vél'bót* 'whaleboat'; *vél'sy* 'Wales'.

(12) **Technology:** *bajt* 'byte'; *bábbit* 'babbit' (mtl.); G. Babbit; *bámper* 'bumper' (r. to car); *baréter* 'barretter' (radio); *bél'tyng* 'belting' (txt.); *blénker, blinker* 'blinker' (tlph. rlw.); *blister* 'blister'; *bljok* 'block' (mech.); F. block, G. Block; *bjlum* 'bloom' (mtl.); F. bloom; *bljúming* 'blooming (mtl.); *bojler* 'boiler'; G. Boiler; *brúder* 'brooder'; *búfer* 'buffer'; *bul'dózer* 'bulldozer'; F. bulldozer, G. Bulldozer; *búster* 'buster engine'; *bušprýt, buhspryt* 'bowsprit'; *čyzel* 'chisel'; *defróster* 'defroster'; *dérrik* 'derrick'; F. derrick; *detéktor* 'detector' (rad.); F. detecteur, G. Detektor; *dónka* 'donkey engine'; *džyger* 'jigger' (cer., mng.); *džip* 'jeep'; *drágljanjn* 'dragline'; *dren, dréna* 'drain'; G. Drän: *drenáž* 'drainage'; G. Dränage; *drenčér* 'drencher'; *dúmper* 'dumper' (mach.); *dúmpkar* 'dumpcar'; *ebonit* 'ebonite' (mtl.); F. ebonite, G. Ebonit; *ekshávster* 'exhauster'; F. exhausteur, G. Exhauster; *ekskavátor* 'excavator'; F. excavateur,

G. Exkavator; *ekspréѕ* 'express'; F. exprès G. Express; *elektrét* 'electret'; *eréktor';* F. erecteur; *eskaljátor* 'escalator'; F. escalator; *faráda* 'farad' (el.); G. Farhrrad; *fíder* 'feeder' (el.); F. feeder; *fil'mpak* 'filmpack'; G. Filmpack; *fiberglas* 'fiberglass'; *flint, flintglás* 'flintglass'; G. Flintglass, *forkámera* 'fore camera'; *forsúnka* 'force pump', 'sprayer'; *gazhol'der* 'gasholder'; *gajdróp* 'guide-rope'; F. guide-rope; *gávč-pres* 'gouge-press'; *géter* 'getter'; *glézer* 'glazer' (paper); F. glaceur; *gréjder* 'grader' (road-const.); *gridlik* 'grid leak' (el.); *hopkalit* 'hopkalite' (ch.); *hedljájner* 'headliner' (mach.); *hóper* 'popper car'; *hon* 'hone' (mtl.); *indéntor* from Eng. 'ident'; *kanistra* 'canister' (cont.); *kétgut* 'catgut' (med.); F. catgut, G. Katgut; *kikstárter* from Eng. 'kick' and 'starter'; *kohérer* 'coherer (rad.); F. cohereur; *koks* 'coke'; F. coke, G. Koks; *kombájn* 'combine' (agr.); *kompávnd* 'compound engine'; *kompjúter* 'computer'; F. computateur, G. Computor; *komprésor* 'compressor'; F. compresseur; *kontróler* 'controller' (street car); F. controleur, G. Kontroleur; *konvéjer* 'conveyer'; 'assembly line'; F. convoyeur, *konvérter* 'converter' (el., mtl.); G. Konverter; *kréking* 'cracking' (pet.); F. cracking, G. Kracking; *kréngel's* 'cringles'; *krešer* 'crusher' (mtl.); *krip* 'creep' (mtl.); *kvárky* 'quark' (phs.); *lázer* 'laser'; *linter* "linter' (txt.); *mázer* 'maser' (rad.); *mal'tóza* 'maltose'; F. maltose, G. Maltose; *mikser* 'mixer' (mtl.); G. Mixer; *mjul'* 'mule' (txt.); *najlón, nejlón* 'nylon'; *napálm* 'napalm'; *nipel'* 'nipple'; G. Nippel; *ofsét* 'offset'; F. off-set; *pikáp* 'pickup truck'; *plúnžer* 'plunger'; F. plongeur; *radár* 'radar'; F. radar, G. Radar; *radióla* 'radiole'; F. radiole; *rezýstor* 'resistor' (el.); *rekórder* 'recorder'; *repelénty* 'repelents' (ch.); *replikácija* 'replication' (ch.); *refrižerator* 'refrigerator'; *rotaprýnt* 'rotaprint'; *rúter* 'rooter' (mach.); *sel'fáktor* 'self-actor' (txt.); *skenatrón* from Eng. 'scan' and '(elec)tron' (mech.); *skéner* 'scanner' (med.); *skrap* 'scrap' (mtl.); *skréper* 'scraper' (road-const.); *skrúber* 'scrubber'; G. Skrubber; *sljab* 'slab' (mtl.); *sljábing* 'slabbing mill'; *spidómetr* 'speedometer'; *sprýnkler* 'sprinkler'; *stáker, starter* 'starter' (mech., sport); *sta'tor* 'stator' (mach.); F. stator, G. Stator; *sto'per* 'stopper' (mech., sport); *stréner* 'strainer'; *strýper* 'stripper'; G. Stripper; *ševjot* 'cheviot' (txt.); F. cheviote; *šunt* 'shunt' (el.); F. shunt, G. Shunt; *tándem* 'tandem'; F. tandem, G. Tandem, *ténder* 'tender'; F. tender, G. Tender; *terylén* 'terylene' (txt.); G. Terylene; *tjúbing,* 'tubing'; *tóster* 'toaster'; G.

Toaster; *tráktor* 'tractor'; F. tracteur, G. Traktor; *trak* 'trak'; *tramblér* 'trembler'; F. trembleur; *tramváj* 'tramway'; F. tramway; *tranzýstor* 'transistor'; G. Transistor; *transbórder* 'transborder'; *transmitter* 'transmitter'; F. transmetteur; *tréjler* 'trajler'; *trýger* 'trigger'; *troléj* 'trolley'; *túmbler* 'tumbler' (rad.); *tvin* 'twine'; *tvistor* 'twister'; *varykáp* 'varykap 'varicap'; *varýstor* 'varistor'; *vat* 'Watt' (el.); *vater* 'water-machine'; *vateržakét* 'water jacket'; *vátmen* 'vatman paper'; *vel'vét* 'velvet'; *videorekórder* 'videorecorder'; *vokodér* 'vocoder' (tlph.); G. Vocoder.

(13) **Social structure:** *džéntl'man';* F. gentleman; G. Gentleman; *eskávjr, skvajr* 'esquire'; *férmer, fármer* 'farmer'; *fešenebel'nyj* 'fashionable'; F. fashionable, G. fashionable, G. fashionabel; *fryhól'dery* 'freeholders'; *grum* 'groom'; *króftery* 'crofters'; *lédi* 'lady'; *lenlórd* 'landlord'; *lord* 'lord'; *lord-mér* "Lord Mayor'; *ménedžer* 'manager'; *óldermen* 'alderman'; *per* 'peer'; F. Pair, G. Peer; *ser* 'sir'; *skváter* 'squatter'; *štévard* 'steward'; G. Steward.

(14) **Politics:** *bitnyk* 'beat+Ukrainian suffix *-nyk* (participants of the rebel movement in U.S.A. and Canada after the second World War); *bil* 'bill'; G. Bill; *bil-bróker* 'bill-broker'; *bljokáda* 'blocade'; G. Blockade; *čárter* 'charter'; *čartýzm* 'chartism'; F. chartisme, G. Chartismus; *čartýsty* 'chartists'; *dajhárdivci* from Eng. 'die-hard'; *džerymenderyng* 'gerrymandering'; *džyngo* 'jingo'; G. Jingo; *džyngojizm* 'jingoism'; *dominión* 'dominion'; F. dominion, G. Dominion; izoljacionism 'isolationism'; *impičment* 'impeachment'; *klobmény* 'clubmen' (in England — 17 c.); *kómoner* 'commoner'; *komunalizm* 'communalism'; G. Kommunalismus; *kongresmén* 'congressman'; *ku-kluks-klan* 'ku-klux-klan' (terrorists in U.S.A.); *lejborýsty* 'laborists'; *parljáment* 'parliament'; F. parliament, G. Parlament; *parljamentarýzm* 'parlamentarism'; G. Parlamentarismus; *parljamentár* 'parlamentarian'; G. Parlamentarier; *radykál* 'radical'; F. radical, G. Radicale(r); *radykalizm* 'radicalism'; F. radicalisme, G. Radikalismus; *spiker* 'speaker'; *sufražýzm* 'suffragism'; *vigy* 'whigs'.

(15) **War:** *dragún* 'dragoon'; F. dragon, G. Dragoner; *kordýt* 'cordite'; F. cordite, G. Kordit; *rejd* 'raid'; F. Raid; *šrapnél'* shrapnel'; F. shrápnel(l), G. Schrapnell; *tank* 'tank'; G. Tank.

(16) **Nature:** *ájsberg* 'iceberg'; F. iceberg, G. Eisberg; *bédlend* 'bad

lands'; *invajronmentalizm* 'environmentalism'; *klif* 'cliff'; *krik* 'creek'; *smog* 'smog'; *skval* 'squal'.

(17) **Geology:** *blister* 'blister copper' (min.); *džespilit* 'jasper' + 'lit' (min.); *fljotácija* 'flotation'; F. flotation; *peneplén* 'peneplain'; F. peneplaine; *rýfli* 'riffles'; *ryft* 'rift'; *trap* 'trap rocks'; *vad* 'wad'; F. wad.

(18) **Zoology:** *aligátor* 'alligator'; F. alligator, G. Alligator; *bul'dóg* 'bulldog'; F. bouledogue, G. Bulldogge; *fokstérjer* 'fox-terrier' (dog); F. fox-terrier, G. Foxterrier; *gibón* 'gibbon'; F. gibbon, G. Givvon; *gorýlja* 'gorilla'; F. gorille, G. Gorilla; *grizli* 'grizzly' (bear); *kengurú* 'kangaroo'; F. kangourou, G. Känguruh; *lémingy* 'lemmings'; F. lemmings, G. Lemming; *lórys* 'loris'; *mustáng* 'mustang'; F. mustang, G. Mustang; *pingviny* 'penguins'; F. pingouin, G. Pinguin; *pójnter* 'pointer' (dog); F. pointer; *séter* 'setter' (dog); G. Setter; *skuns, skons* 'skunks'; *šórthorn* 'shorthorn' (cattle); *šrópšyry* 'Shropshires'; *terjery* 'terriers'.

(19) **Miscellaneous:** *bar* 'bar'; F. bar, G. Bar; *bedlám* 'bedlam'; *bekros* 'backcrossing'; *biheviorýzm* 'behaviorism'; F. behaviorisme, G. Behaviorismus; *blef* 'bluff'; F. bluff, G. Bluff; *bojskávt* 'boy scout'; F. boy-scout; *brejnštórm* 'brain-storm'; *bukméker* 'book-maker' (in horse race); *bumeráng* 'boomerang'; F. boumerang, G. Bumerang; *búngalo, béngalo* 'bungalow'; F. bungalow, G. Bungalow; *búnker* 'bunker'; G. Bunker; *dájka, déjka* 'dike, dyke'; *dansyng* 'dansing hall'; *déndi* 'dandy'; F. dandy, G. Dandy; *dyspetčer* 'dispatcher'; *dyzájn* 'design'; *dóping* 'doping' (med.); *džókéj* 'jockey'; F. jocky, G. Jockei; *džúngli* 'jungle'; F. jungle, G. Dschungel; *džut* 'jute'; F. jute, G. Jute' *fil'm* 'film'; F. film, G. GFilm; *flat* 'flat'; *flomáster* 'flomaster'; *folkljór* 'folklore'; F. folk-lore, G. Folklore; *gángster* 'gangster'; F. gangster, G. Gangster; *gérlskavt* 'girl scout'; *hájvej* 'highway'; *hol* 'hall'; *intervjú* 'interview'; F. interview (a backborrowing), G. Interview; *keb* 'cab'; *kémping* 'camping'; *kóledž* 'college'; *komfórt* 'comfort'; G. Komfort; *komfortábel'nyj* 'comfortable'; F. confortable, G. komfortabel; *komiks* 'comics'; *konstébl'* 'constable'; (*kotédž* 'cottage'; F. cottage; *kovbój* 'cowboy'; *krosyngóver* 'crossingover'; *krup* 'croup' (illness; horse's back); F. croup, G. Krupp; *kvákery* 'quakers'; F. quakers, *labelistyka* from Eng. 'label' (collection of labels); *lekisty* from Eng. 'lake' (lit.); *lider* 'leader'; *lift* 'lift', 'elevator'; G. Lift; *linčuvánnja* 'lynching'; F. lynchage, G. Lynchen; *lóbi, lobisty* from Eng.

'lobby'; *lobism* 'lobbyism'; *mis* 'miss'; misis 'mistress'; *mister* 'mister'; *mityng* 'meeting'; *mohikány* 'Mohicans'; F. mohikan, G. Mohikaner; *Fmokasýny* 'moccasyns' foot wear); F. mocassin, G. Mokassin; *op-art* 'op-art' (abbr. optical art); *pamflét* 'pamphlet'; F. pamphlet, G. Pamphlet; *park* 'park'; F. Park, G. Park; *pik-áp* 'pick-up' (automobile, instrument); *plej-bój* 'playboy'; *polismén* 'policeman'; F. policeman; *purytány* 'puritans'; *rekórd* 'record'; F. record, G. Rekord; *sejf* 'safe'; G. Safe; *sérvis* 'service'; F. service; *syneráma* 'cinerama'; *skeb* 'scab'; *štrajkbréxer* (in England and U.S.A.); *skeč* 'sketch'; *skip* 'skip'; *skver* 'square'; . square; *sleng* 'slang'; G. Slang; *snájper* 'sniper'; *snájpyng* 'sniping'; *snob* 'snob'; F. snob, G. Snob; *snobizm* 'snobbism'; *spidvéj* 'speed-way'; *spin* 'spin' (phs.); *spič* 'speech'; splin 'spleen' (fig.) 'melancholy'; F. spleen, G. Spleen, *standárt* 'standard'; G. Standard; *statýstyka* 'statistics'; F. statistique, G. Statistik; *stend* 'stand'; *stres* 'stress'; F. Stress (med.); *supermárket* 'supermarker'; *supermén* 'superman'; G. Superman (ironically); *supersélery* 'supersellers' (rel. to books); *svityng, svéjtyng* 'sweating'; *šampun* 'shampoo'; possibly through F. shampooing, G. Shampoo; *šaver* 'shower'; G. Schauer; *tajfún* 'typhoon'; F. typon, toufan, G. Taifun; *tank* 'tank' (cont.); G. Tank; *tent* 'tent'; F. tente; *test* 'test' (psch.); F. test, G. Test; *tópkros* 'top crossing'; *transépt* 'transept'; F. transept; *tráper* 'trapper'; G. Trapper; *trujizm* 'trism'; F. truisme *xuligán* 'hooligan'; *veránda* 'veranda'; G. Veranda; *verdýkt* 'verdict'; F. verdict, G. Verdikt; *vérdžynel* 'virginal' (music. instr.); F. virginale; *véstern* 'western' (cowboy film); *vikénd* 'weekend'.

3. Methods of integration of English loanwords[6]

(1) Simple transfer with no Ukrainian synonyms. By this method the English word has been transferred entirely in its form and meaning, though with more or less complete substitution of Ukrainian phonemes. The transferred word has no Ukrainian extension by a synomyn. Some examples are: *ájsberg* 'iceber'; *avt* 'out', *autsájder* 'outsider', *bejsból, bezból* 'baseball', *bóbslej* 'bob-sleigh', *bojkót* 'boycott, *bojskávt* 'boy

[6] Weinreich, U. [. . .], pp. 47-62.

scout', *boks* 'box' (sport), *boksér* 'boxer', *bróker* 'broker', *brydž* 'bridge', *bul'dózer* 'bulldozer', *ček* 'check', *džaz* 'jazz', *foxstrót* 'fox trot', *harpún* 'harpoon', *kórner* (in soccer) 'corner', *sérver* (in tennis) 'server', *réjder* 'raider', *spin* (phys.) 'spin', *snob* 'snob', *spidómeter*, and many others. This method is particularly reflected in nautical and technological terminology.

(2) Some loanwords, however, can be replaced by Ukrainian synonyms. In such cases phonemes of the original English sources are utilized in these loanwords but are not utilized in their synonyms. In the examples below, the Engish loanword is given first, its English original source second, and the Ukrainian synonym(s) third: *bek* (in soccer) 'back' — *zaxysnýk, oborónec'; déndi* 'dandy' — *frant, džygún, ház-hol'der* 'gasholder' — *hazosxóvyšče; gol* (in soccer) 'goal' — *voróta; hóper* 'hopper car'— *samoskýd, samorozvantážnyj váhón; lider* 'leader' — *kerivnýk, providnýk; lift* 'lift' — *mašynopidójma; mikser* 'mixer' — *zmišuvač; plejbój* 'play boy' — *hul'visa; standárt* 'standard' — *nórma, zrazók* and many others. Sometimes a synonym is expressed by a word-combination as shown by the Ukrainian correspondents of the loan-word *hoper*.

(3) English borrowing consisting of more than one morpheme can be rendered by so-called loan translation (known in French as a calque) in which the model is reproduced exactly, element by element.[7] This is a literal, verbatim translation of the model: *héfbek* 'halfback' — *pivzax-ysnýk, mityng* 'meeting' — *zústrič, zbóry, zasidánnja; šel'terdék* 'shelter-deck' — *zaxysná páluba; supermén* 'superman' — *nadljudýna; transmit-ter* 'transmitter' — *peredaváč* and others.

(4) Another means of reproducing English loanwords in Ukrainian is by loan rendition (Lehnübertragung). According to this method, the model is not translated element by element as in loan translation but merely offers a general idea or starting point for the translation. Examples are: *aperkót* 'upper-cut' (in boxing) — *udár znýzu; békhénd* 'back-hand' — *udár zliva; gólkiper* 'goal keeper' — *vorotár; brekváter* 'break-

[7] Weinreich, U. [...], p. 51: various kinds of iron translation.

water' — *xvyleriz, mol*; infájtyng — *blýz'kyi bij; ofsájd* 'off side' — *poza hróju; supermárket* 'supermarket' — *mahazýn samoobsluhóvuvannja; skuns* 'skunks (pl., skunk sg.)' — *smerdjáčka* and others.

(5) Hybrids. Only a part of the English word (morpheme) has been imported while a Ukrainian portion has been substituted for the rest (see later, under 7).

(6) Neologisms can also be created but they are very rare: *vateržakét* 'water jacket' — *šáxtna pič; váter* 'water-machine' — *prjadýl'na mašyna.*

Some transfers with no Ukrainian synonyms occupy, so to speak, a relatively firm place in modern Ukraine, the lack of original Ukrainian equivalents being the main reason. Those loanwords which have been extended by Ukrainian synonyms display a tendency to be replaced by these synonyms and to occupy a secondary place. Loan translations and loan renditions show even more prepensity to replace the original borrowings.

4. The stylistical evaluation of English loanwords

Some borrowings, such as *brydž, bekón, bifštéks, bréndi, fil'm, boks, boksér, pulóver, skeč, čempión, sport* and numerous others have become an integral part of general cultured Ukrainian vocabulary. Some borrowings are used predominantly in certain fields by a narrower strata of the society, such as mariners, technologists, economists, physicians and other professionals. Such loanwords usually require concomitatnt descriptive explanatory phrases, for instance, *brýdel', dédvejt, čýksy, kil'son, slip, sljab, superkárgo, búster, džýger, faráda, lokávt, ryng, konvérter* etc. Still other loanwords refer to non-Ukrainian culture, mostly Anglo-Saxon and American. Examples: *kolédž* does not replace either Ukrainian *himnázija*, or *desjatylitka,* or *universytét. Mister* (abbr. Mr.), *misis* (abbr. Mrs.) and *mis* precede only Ango-Sanxon names. *Lord* belongs exclusively to Anglo-Saxon social structure. The names of dances, such as *tustép, rok-n-ról, šejk* and others reflect their non-Ukrainian origin and are limited usually to American sphere of amusements (though they have spread to Europe too). The term *trápper* refers only to fur trapper in North America. The loanword *avtsájdery*

denotes enterprises not belonging to big corporations; *lizhól'dery* were landholders in England in the 13th to 19th centuries; *krópery* is found only in the southern states of the United States; *linčuvánnja* usually refers to the United States. Many examples can be given.

In many loanwords one can see a narrowing of the semanic of the original; the loanword *square* can serve as an example. Its literal meaning is 'an equilateral rectangle' or anything resembling this form. In the United States, it denotes 'a town or city block, consisting of a four-sided space on each side of which is a street'; also 'the distance along one of these sides; a block'. In Ukrainian, this loanword acquired the meaning of 'a little town garden with decorative trees and flowerbeds'. This semanic narrowing might have come about under the influence of the intermediary language, French, in which *square* has similar meaning. Another example is *ketgut*. The lexical meaning of its original source is broader than that in Ukrainian. In English, it means a dried and twisted cord made from the intestines of animals, usually sheep, and used as strings for musical instruments, tennis rackets, etc. In Ukrainian, it means only 'threads from small cattle intestines used for surgery'.

5. The phonological integration of English loanwords

In English, there are 21 vowel phonemes, of which twelve are monophthongs and nine are diphthongs; the Ukrainian vowel system comprises six vowel phenomes, all monophthongs. Therefore it often happens that one Ukrainian vowel is used to substitute for several English vowels. Below are the original English vocalic phonemes and their usual reflections in Ukrainian loanwords.[8]

[8] The phonemic transcription of English used in this part is that of Trager, George L. and Smith, Henry L.: *An Outline of English Structure*, 5th printing, Washington 1962.

English phoneme	Ukrainian phoneme	Loanwords in Ukrainian examples
/i/	/i/, /y/	*biznes, klif, brydž*
/iy/	/i/	*hit, kil'son, mityng.* Exceptions are: *turnéps* 'turnips' and *krengel's* 'cringles'.
/e/	/e/	*skeč, sérver.* The exception is *svityng;* its variant *svéjtyna* and the noun *déjdvud,* with /ej/ instead of /e/ reflects a hyper-Anglicism.
/ey/	often: /ej/	*bejzbo'l, brejnšto'rm*
	sometimes: /e/	*el' keks, tőpsel'.*
/ae/, aeh/	usually: /e/	*békhénd, déndi, ket.*
	sometimes: /a/	*bandžo, džaz, handyka'p.*
/ə/	/e/, /a/, /u/	*báftyng, bámper, démping.*
/ay/	usually: /aj/	*dajm, kombajn.* Exception is *brydel* where /aj/ is replaced by /y/.
/aw/	usually: /av/	*bojskavt, lokavt.*[9]
/u/, /uw/	/u/	*bljum, bum, buster.*

The above correspondences are not affected by the position of stress. The phonemic correspondences listed below depend on the stress in the English original.

[9] The English dyphthong (aw) is usually rendered as (av) in Ukrainian. Therefore, its substitution for (au) throughout *Slovnyk inšomovynyx sliv* of Mel'nyčuk is incorrect.

English phoneme	Ukrainian phoneme	Loanwords in Ukrainian examples
/a/, /ah/	often: /o/	*boks, dólar;* also in prestressed position: *boksér, koktéjl.*
	sometimes: /a/	*lag, ljard.*
/ow/	/o/	*bróker, póker.*
/oy/	/oj/	*kovbój, plejbój.*
/oh/	often: /o/	*bul'dóg, hol, kort.*
	sometimes: /a/	*tral, vátervejs:* when unstressed: *ofsét, forsúnka.*

The above English and Ukrainian vowel correlation shows that there is a general tendency to render English vowels by the closest Ukrainian phonemes in the loanwords under discussion. Of course, due to the fact that there are only six vowel phonemes in Ukrainian against twenty-one English phonemes (including diphthongs and monophtongs), some English phonemic distinctions (e.g. /i/-/iy/, /a/-/aeh/, /u/-/uw/ are lost in Ukrainian.

Consonantal phonemic and phonetic correspondences between English and Ukrainian are quite clear. Differences lie in the absence of soft and long consonants in English and in the presence of soft consonants in Ukrainian (except for /p, b, f, v, m, g, x/) appearing before /i/. Ukrainian /l'/ substituting for English /l/ occurs in several loanwords: *bul'dózer, fljáter, koktéjl', kopihól'dery, ljard, regláјn, sljab, vel'bót, vel'vét,* etc. English prevocalic and postvocalic /w/ is rendered as /v/: *klovn, krosvórd, svityng, trávler,* etc. English /g/ is reproduced as /ga/: *gréjder, gréjpfrut, grog,* etc., and not as /h/ listed in Soviet dictionaries.[10]

Thus, in general, the Ukrainian rendition of the English loanwords in their phonemic and phonetic aspect remains fairly close to the origi-

[10] In Soviet dictionaries only the letter *h* is used in all such instances to bring the Ukrainian orthography closer to Russian.

nal source. The closer these correspondences are, the stronger the indication that the loanword passed to Ukrainian directly from English. The coincidence of the stress in the loanwords and in the original English source and the similarity of pronunciation of the sounds symbolized by the English letter *j* and *g* as *dž,* a long *i* as *aj, ai* as *ej* etc., all indicate that English has been the immediate source of the loanword (cf. *dájka* 'dike', *dajm* 'dime', *džut* 'jute', *kolédž* 'college', *réjder* 'raider' etc.).

6. Inflectional integration

Over 99 percent of the loanwords are nouns.

(1) Declinable nouns. The last sound of an English loanword is perceived as a Ukrainian ending by means of which the gender and the stem is determined. Since most English nouns terminate in a hard consonant, the overwhelming majority of loan-nouns are hard-stem masculine and are declined accordingly in sing. and pl.. Soft-stem masculine nouns are: *bárel', báterfljaj, bóbslej, búšel, džokéj, el', hókej, kovbój, konstébl', krol', mjul', nipel', plejbój, spidvéi, srapnél', topsél', tránec, trólej* and *trýsol.* The final consonant /j/ corresponds to English /j/ and /l'/ to English /l/.

A small number of nouns are feminine and have the ending /-a(-ja)/: *dájka(or déjka), dónka, drága, džyga, faktórija, faráda, fljotácija, forkámera, forsúnka, gička, gorýlja, gutapérča, kanistra, mal'tóza, pižama, radiola, replikácija, senéga, statýstyka, syneráma, veránda.* The English endings /-a(-ja)/, /-tion/ and rarely occurring /-y/ have been adapted in Ukrainian as /-a(/ja)/, /-cija/ an /-a/ respectively.

A limited number of nouns occur in the plural only (pluralia tantum): *avtsájdery, brýdži* (rel. to riding), *čýksy, čýpsy, džúngli, fryhól'dery, kómingsy, kopilól'dery, krópery, lejborýsty, lémingy, lizhól'dery, luddýty, repelénty, rýfli, supersélery, šórty, šropšyry, terjéry, vél'sy.* In this group, *džúngli* and *rýfli* render the English 'jungle' and 'riffle', occurring only in singular.

Several English plural nouns have been adapted in singular form. Thus, *bifštéks,* nom. sg., *bifštéksa,* gen. sg., *befšteksy,* no. pl. etc. Other examples include: *flortýmbers, kómiks, kréngel's, pirs, pilers, pártners, skuns, steps, tóptymbers, turnéps.*

Indeclinable nouns end in /-i/, /-u/ and /-o/: *dendi, džersi, lobi, penni, pačuli, prosperity, viski, kenguru, superkargo.* Exception is kokakola (with the ending /-a/).

7. Deriving loanwords and their derivatives

Some English loanwords form so-called hybrids, that is, words composed of English and Ukrainian morphemes. This kind of derivation is sporadic. The noun *bitnyk* (see 2.14) is a hybrid of the English base 'beat' and the Ukrainian suffix *-nyk*. The Ukrainian suffix *-ec'* of the noun *tránec'* has replaced the English last syllable *-som* of the word 'transom'. The suffix *'ivec'* has been attached to 'die hard' to form the noun *dajhardivec',* usually appearing in plural as *dajhardivci,* the name of the conservative party in England (2.14) By means of the suffix *-až* the noun *trena'ž* (2.10) was formed from the base *tren* < 'train'. The stem of *bul'dozer 'bulldózer'* (see 2.12) + suffix *-yst* — *bul'dozerýst; 'label'* + *-istyka(a)* — *labelistyka* (2.19); the element *-tion* of 'replication' and 'flotation' was replaced by Ukrainian element *-cija* — *replikácija, fljotácija* (2.12; 2.17); *xuligán* < 'hooligan' (2.19) + *-k(a)* — *xuligánka.* From 'force pump' derived was *forsúnka* by means of the compound suffix *-un-k- (cf. brex-ún- 'he lier', brexún-k-a 'she lier', lasún-lasúnka).* On the stem of *xuligán* (2.19) the abstract noun *xuligánstvo* was built. By means of the verbal suffix *-uva-* and infinitive formant *-ty* the following verbs were obtained: *bojkotuváty* from *bojkót* 'boycott'; *boksuváty* from *boks* 'boks'; *eksportuváty* from *ékspórt* 'export'; *importuváty* from *impórt* 'import'; *linčuvaty* from 'to lynch'; *trenuváty* from *tren* 'train'. A few adjectives were derived by means of the suffixes *-s'k-* and *-n-: xuligáns'kyi, bul'dózernyj, fešnébél'nyj, komfortábel'nyj, rekórdnyj.*

8. Stress in loanwords

Stess involves difficulties connected with many inconsistencies. There are many loanwords with stress different from that of the original English words and from the stress of the words of the main intermediary languages, French and German. It shifts in these words to the ultimate in the adopted Ukrainian form. Examples: *basketból, bekón, futból, biznesmén, bul'dóg, čempión, dyskónt, fokstrót, handykáp, kil'b-*

'lok, kingston, koferdám, koktéjl', kovbój, krosvórd, lenglórd, rekórd, šel'terdék, supermén, tramváj ect. Almost all loanwords terminating in *-er* have stress on the penultimate, and it coincides with the stress of the original English word. Examples are: *blister, bróker, búnker, drýbler, drýfter, džóker, gángster, liver, pójnter, pórter, póker, pulóver, róker, spiker, sprýnter* etc. Exceptions are: *trenažér, vokodér.*

It might be tempting to seek an explanation for the shift of stress to the ultimate in the influence of the intermediary language, French, in which many of the words listed also exist. However, a considerable number of English words do not exist in French, e.g. *baterfljáj, kil'blók, kingstón, kvaterdék,* etc. and could not influence such a shift of stress. It is also noteworthy that some German borrowings in Ukrainian show a similar shift: *abzác* 'Absatz', *ljandkárta* 'Landkarte', *ljandšáft* 'Lándschaft', *perljamúter* 'Perlmutter', *policmájster* 'Polizéimeister'. At the same time many German borrowings (perhaps even the majority) retain their original German stress, e.g.: *ljándver* 'Lándwehr', *ljándgraf* 'Lándgraf', *ljándrat* 'Lándrat', *ljándsknext* 'Lándsknecht', *ljándtag* 'Lándtag' etc.[11] The original English stress on the root of some other borrowings is used by Holoskevyč in his *Pravopysnyk slovnyk,* e.g. *hókej* (not hokéj). At this point we can only state that in some English loanwords the stress shifts to the ultimate; these occurrences may be connected with the influence of French as an intermediary vehicle, or with the pressure of the Soviet policy, or both.[12]

9. Conclusion and prognosis for their survival in the future

The vocabulary of the Ukrainian language at its present stage of development contains a considerable quantity of English loanwords. A relatively small number has been fully integrated into it; like many

[11] In Holoskevyč's *Pravopysnyj slovnyk* the stress in these words fall on the first syllable as in German; in Mel'nyčuk's *Slovnyk inšomovnyx sliv* these words have stress on the final syllable.

[12] Soviet policy tends to bring the Ukrainian language closer to Russian and to strengthen the vehicle of the formation of a "Soviet individual" with dominating Russian language and culture.

loanwords from other languages — German, French, Turkish etc. they will live in the Ukrainian language forever. These are words which are common to and used in various realms of life of the Ukrainian people, and for which no synonyms have been created. Due to their frequent use they come easily to mind are therefore more stable. Loanwords for which the Ukrainian language has already created synonyms, loan transitions and loan renditions have undergone a process of reduction in usage and replacement by the synonyms, particularly in those cases where such creations consist of a single word. At an uncertain stage of intergration are loan terms in the natural sciences and their closely related branches. It seems that those terms which exist in the same or almost the same morphonemic shape and lexical meaning in English, French, German and other languages will be adopted by the Ukrainian language much more easily than those loanwords which are characteristic only of the English language in this respect. A tendency to replace the latter by Ukrainian equivalents built in conformity with the inherent laws of the Ukrainian language and consisting of one word will prevail and will lead to the reduction of this group of loanwords. The tendency of replacement diminishes if the creation consists of two or more words, and does not come to life at all if the creation corresponds to a longer descriptive phrase because, as has been said at the beginning, using ready-made designations, particularly if they do not occur as combinations of two words, is more economical than describing things afresh.

Problems requiring further investigation include the establishment of a relative chronology of the influx of English loanwords into Ukrainian and the extent of the role of the intermediary languages, mainly French and German, in that process.

Brief Comments on the Formation of Neologisms in Modern Ukrainian

Sometimes journalists and even writers incorrectly use a root, a stem or an affix of Ukrainian morphological units and form a new word or make a loan-translation of a foreign word, thinking that by so doing they create a neologism and enrich vocabulary of the Ukrainian language. The intention is good, but its materialization is often useless because the new word lacks correct structural elements and is thus doomed to die at the start. The formation of a neologism must follow the natural inherent laws of the language and avoid the mechanistic combination of formative elements. Such a process requires the careful selection of the proper morphemes to be joined. In this article I shall analyze this matter on a few examples encountered in the Ukrainian press.

One such word is *часопи́сня* /časopýsn'a/* used by the author in his article in the Ukrainian journal *Slovo na storoži* (Word on Guard), 1971, p. 19. The author of this article gave the following reason for his statement: *Kimnáta, de čytájut' lyšé časópysy, povýnna nazyvátys'a časopýsn'a* 'A room where the people read only newspapers should be called *newspaper-room*'. This neologims was approved by Prof. I. Ohijenko but rejected by Prof. J.B. Rudnyc'kyj. Both are renowned philol-

* slanted brackets mark phonemic transcription of the word enclosed in them.

ogists, yet Rudnyc'kyj was correct in denying the above "neologism" the right to enter the vocabulary of the Ukrainian literary language. To see why, let us look, for example, at the suffixes -yn- (Cyrillic -ин-) and -n-(Cyrillic -н-). Its combination with a root denoting an animal results in a new word with the meaning "the meat" or "the flesh" of that animal: *barán* 'ram', *barán-yn-a* 'mutton'; *tel'á* 'calf', *tel'át-yn-a* 'veal'; *hus'á* 'gosling', *hus'át-yn-a* 'goose(-flesh)'; *kin'* 'horse', *kon-ýn-a* 'horse-meat/ flesh'; *svyn'á* 'pig', *svyn-ýn-a* 'pork'. But when we combine the same suffix -yn- with an inanimate noun we obtain a singular (with stress on that suffix) with the basic meaning of the root of the singular: *pérl-y* 'pearls' (collect.), *perl-ýn-a* 'a single pearl'; *s'n'ih* 'snow' (collect.), *s'n'iž-ýn-a* 'snow-flake', *horóx* 'pea' (collect.), *horoš-ýn-a* 'a single pea', *trav-á* 'grass' (collect.), *trav-ýn-a* 'a blade of grass', *solóma* 'straw' (collect.), *solom-ýn-a* 'a blade of straw'. However, one may not form singulars by means of the suffix -yn- from all substantive roots (bases) of the above type. It would be wrong, e.g., to form from the substantive stems *sáž*-a 'soot', *vod*-á 'water', *vóvn*-a 'wool' nouns *saž-ýn-a, vod-ýn-a, vovn-ýn-a.* Suffix -yn- cannot be combined with the base of an abstract noun, e.g., one cannot form a noun *bid-ýn-a* from *bid-á* 'misfortune', *muč-ýn-a* from *múk-a* 'torment, suffering' etc. Likewise, to the verbal root-stem *kos-ý-ty* 'to mow' we add the suffix -ar-ϕ to form the noun *kos-ár* 'mower, reaper', but this suffix cannot be added to the verbal root-stem *molot-ý-ty* 'to thresh' and build a noun *molot-ár* with the meaning 'thresher' because this meaning is produced by joining the suffix -il'nyk (or -nyk), i.e., the noun with the meaning 'thresher' is *molot-íl'nyk* (or *molót-nyk*). Thus a useful selection of suffixal morphemes in the process of word-building cannot be absolutely free, without any restrictions.

As for the suffix -n'-a, it can be used to form nouns with the following meanings: 1) collectiveness with derogatory shade of meaning, e.g., *bos'ač-n'-á* 'vagabonds', *komaš-n'-a* 'ants', etc. (with the stress on the suffix); 2) non-effective yet intensive action, e.g., *metuš-n'-á* 'fuss, turmoil', *hul'-n'-á* 'carouse', *svar-n'-á* 'quarrel' (with the stress on the suffix); 3) names of structures (lodgings) and places of work or actions, e.g., *l'ikár-n'-a* 'hospital', *drukár-n'-a* 'printing house', *moločár-n'-a* 'dairy', *pekár-n'-a* 'bakery', *mjasár-n'-a* 'butcher's shop', *majstér-n'-a*

'workshop', etc. (with stress on the suffix -ar and -er).

The proposed neologism *časopýs'na* does not possess any of the characteristics of the nouns under 1), 2) and 3). Structurally, nouns under 1) and 2) have one root-stem, whereas *časopýsn'a* has two root-stems connected by the vowel *o: čas-o-pýs-n'-a*. Nouns of the third type (*l'ikárn'a, pekárn'a,* etc.) are closer in lexical-semantic characteristics to the word *časopýsn'a* than nouns of the first two types, but they already have suffix -ar- which in combination with the root makes a deriving stem *(pek-ar-, l'ik-ar-)* extended by another suffix, -n'-a. Such a combination is not found in the word *casopýsn'a* either. From the semantic point of view this noun would not denote a structure (lodging) or place of work, occupation, condition, as is characteristic of the nouns of the third type.

The simple suffix -n'-a in contemporary Ukrainian is unproductive in the formation of nouns denoting structures (dwellings) designed for determining a status or for performing an action or work related to the contents expressed by the roots of the nouns (cf. e.g., *kúx-n'-a* 'kitchen', *stáj-n'-a* 'stable'). Such a function is more often performed by its extended shape -l'n'-a, rarely -yl'n'-a, -al'n'-a combined with the infinitive stem, e.g., *čytá-ty — čytá-l'n'-a* 'reading room', *prá-ty — prá-l'n'-a* 'laundry', *krasý-ty — -krasý-l'n'-a* 'dye-house', *xolodý-ty — xolodý-l'n'-a* 'ice-room', and the suffix -al'n'-a in combination with the present tense stem, e.g., *jísty — jid-ál'n'-a* 'dining room'. There is a possibility for the formation of a neologism *s'pivá-l'n'-a* 'a room designed for singing or singers' from *spivá-ty,* but there is no such possibility for a neologism *muzyká-l'-n'-a* 'a room for music' because there is no verb *muzyká-ty,* or for a neologism *časopysá-l'n'-a* 'a room for reading newspapers' because there is no verb *časopysá-ty* or a neologism *časopýs-n'-a* because there is no verb *časopýs-ty.*

If one ignores the principles of the word-building indicated above and uses the word *časopýsn'a* to denote 'a room for reading newspapers', then one might produce other anomalous neologisms such as *žurnál'-n'-a* 'a room designed for reading journals only' and *knýž-n'-a* 'a room for reading books only'. Thus the traditional word *čytál'n'a* 'a reading room' is the best term and the only one for conveying its pur-

pose, which is reading varieties of printed word, i.e., newspapers, journals and books.

*

In one newspaper we read the following phrase: *Na n'óho móžna čyslýty, ce spolehlýva l'udýna* 'One can count on him, he is a reliable person'. By the phrase *spolehlýva l'udýna* the author means "a reliable person", "a trustworthy person" based on a loan-translation of the German word "zuverlässig" or of the English "reliable". However, as we shall see, his intended neologism *spolehlývyj* has no grounding from the standpoint of word-building in contemporary Ukrainian.

Structurally, the above word consists of the following morphemes: *s(<z)-po-leh-lyv-yj.* The combination of the first two morphemes, that is, *spo-* is unproductive in contemporary Ukrainian. The root -leh- is not compatible in this word; cf. *l'ah-tý, po-l'ah-tý, po-lo-žý-ty, po-klás-ty* etc. in which the roots have no vowel *e*. It is true that this root is found in some words, e.g., *napo-leh-lý-vyj, pid-léh-lyj,* but their meaning is different in semantic scope than that of the adjective *spolehlývyj.* Above all, the suffix -lyv- imparts to this adjective the meaning "one whose characteristic is based upon the meaning of the root combined with the prefix", e.g., *napolehlývyj* (from *napol'aháty* 'to insist') means "one whose characteristic is to insist", not "one who deserves insistance"; *soromlývyj* means "a bashful, shy individual" not "an individual who makes somebody bashful, shy". As a consequence, the adjective *spolehlývyj,* with the suffix -lyv-, would better mean "one whose characteristic quality is to rely upon somebody, to trust somebody, to have confidence in somebody" and not "one whose characteristic quality is to be relied upon, to be trustworthy". In addition, it should be noted that a verb *spol'aháty* does not exist in modern Ukrainian. Hence, reasoning from its parts, the meaning of the neologism *spolehlývyj* is practically opposite to the meaning conveyed by the word *pévnyj* 'trusty', or by the description *toj, xto zasluhóvuje na dovirja* 'a trusty man', both being equivalents of the German "zuverlässig" and of the English "reliable".

Following the principles of word-building in contemporary Ukrainian, one may form a compound adjective *dovirehídnyj* or *dovirohídnyj* 'trustworthy' (an English synonym of the ajective 'reliable') in which the stem of the noun *dovírja* or *dovíra* 'trust, confidence' is combined with the adjective *hídnyj* 'worthy, deserving' by means of the connectinig vowel *e* or *o*. The neologism *dovirohídnyj* or *dovirehídnyj* is supported by the already existing compound adjective *virohídnyj* 'credible'. Though this neologism is not listed in dictionaries of contemporary Ukrainian, all the word-building prerequisites for its right to be used in literary language are present.

In one of popular newspapers we read the following subordinate sentence: *kolý búdut' dostúpni bíl'še spol'ajájuči informáciji* 'when more reliable information will be attainable'. The adjective *spol'ahájučyj* in the above phrase is a neologism used in the same meaning as the unsuccessful neologism *spolehlývyj,* that is, in a passive meaning, not active. However, adjectives with the suffix -uč-, once formed as present participles from transitive or intrasitive verbs, have no passive meaning in modern Ukrainian. Consequently, the word-combination *spol'ahájuči informáciji* does not have the meaning intended by its author, namely *virohídni informáciji* 'trustworthy information' but *informáciji, ščo spol'ahájut',* although the verb *spol'aháty* does not even exist. In other words the 'information' in the above sentence logically functions as an active subject and not as a passive subject or an object, i.e., the information relies on the subject and not vice versa. Thus *spol'ahájučyj* intended to serve as a translation-loan of the German word "zuverlässig" or of the English word "reliable" is also unsuccessful.

*

In the realm of neologisms one also encounters loan-words, justifiable when in modern Ukrainian no words exist which would express the meaning of the original linguistic source. The use of the word *bol'nýc'a* 'hospital' in O. Hončar's novel *Sobór* (Cathedral) from Russian *bol'n'íca* is therefore unjustifiable. In Russian it was formed from the stem of the adjectival substantive *bol'nój* 'patient' and the suffix -ic-a; in Ukrainian there is no such adjective. The Ukrainian equivalent of the Russian *bol'*-

nój is *xvóryj,* and Russian *bol'n'íca* corresponds to Ukrainian *l'ikárn'a* or the word *špytál'* borrowed long ago, probably from Polish *szpítal.*

It is useful to enrich the vocabulary of modern Ukrainian by creating needful neologisms. In this process it is necessary to utilize the word-building elements of the Ukrainian language, that is, its morphemes, whether from already existing Ukrainian words or from loanwords. However, in this process the selection of these elements cannot be arbitrary, but should follow the inherent word-building laws of the Ukrainian language. The selection and combination of structural elements should be characteristic of these laws; otherwise a neologism will be artificial, unnatural and unable of living.

On the Equivalent of German Names and Terms in ü in Ukrainian Phonology and Orthography

This short article is limited to an analysis of the orthographic and phonological aspects of some German names and terms with *ü* in Ukrainian with no description of their morphological adaptation. The problem refers mainly to a discrepancy and inconsistancy in their usage in Ukrainian emigré newspapers and journals in comparison to such forms in the widely used orthographic dictionary by H. Holoskevyč.[1]

In the press readers encounter forms *Мю́нхен* and *Мінхен* (German *München*), *Ню́рнберґ* and *Нірнберґ* (German *Nürnberg*), *Тю́бінґен* and *Тібінґен* (German *Tübingen*) etc. Some critics comment that Ukrainian forms with *ю* in the above names of the German cities are wrong and that *ю* should be replaced by *i* because the German *ü* is closer to the Ukrainian *i* than to *ю*. However, that reasoning is false, and does not reflect an objective statement of the matter. The Ukrainian /i/[2] is a front vowel, of high rise, narrow, and from the phonetic and phonemic standpoint differs from the German *ü* much more than the Ukrainian /u/ (Cyrillic *y*) in conjunction with the preceding palatalized

[1] H. Holoskevyč, *Pravopysnyj slovnyk,* 8th ed., New York, 1955.
[2] / / indicates phonemic transcription.

/m' n' t'/ (Cyrillic *м'н'т'*) because /u/ is high, back rounded similar to the German /*ü*/. Therefore the forms *Мюнхен, Нюрнберґ, Тюбінґен* with syllables *Мю-, Ню-, Тю-,* present correct orthographic forms reflecting phonetic and phonemic similarity, and as such they are listed in the above cited dictionary.

This statement is also supported by historic-traditional criteria. Let us take an example: An American who has been living for a long time in Germany, when conversing with a German would pronounce German city of Munich the way his German collocutor and German people pronounce it, i.e., *München,* but when writing an article in English that American would write the name of that city American way, that is, *Munich* and in his conversations with another American or Englishman he would pronounce [Munik]. He would do so by tradition. The German names *München, Nürnberg* etc. have been used in Ukrainian orthography as *Мюнхен, Нюрнберґ* etc. for a very long time, they are pronounced and spelled that way by vast majority of the Ukrainian people, and they are listed that way in H. Holoskevyč's dictionary, written on the basis of the Ukrainian orthography approved by the National Academy of Sciences in Kiev and by the Shevchenko Scientific Society in Lviv in 1928.[3] Similar arguments apply also to other German loanwords in Ukrainian where German *ü* after labial consonants is usually conveyed in Ukrainian spelling by the letter *ю* denoting /u/ combined with the preceding palatalized consonant, or by the letter *у* (Cyrillic) denoting /u/ combined with the preceding nonpalatalized consonant. The variation of these letters and their phonetic correspondence depends on the relative chronology of the adoption of such German words in Ukrainian. In general, the leading principle of the 1928 orthography was a differentiation between loan-words adopted very long ago and those adopted in more recent times. Therefore, on the one hand, one finds such words as *бюстгáльтер* /b'usthalter/ 'brassiere' borrowed from

[3] On the basis of that orthography orthographic reference-books were published by renowned Ukrainian phonologists Jaroslav B. Rudnyc'kyj and Yurij Šerex (=Shevelov). It also became integral part of the grammars of Olexander Synjavs'kyj, Yurij Šerex, Pantalejmon Kovaliv and others.

the German *Büstenhalter* in the 20th century[4] and *бюст* /b'ust/ 'bust' borrowed from the German *Büste,*[5] probably very late also (the ultimate source being Italian *busto*) and, on the other hand, the term *бурґомістер* /burgomister/ 'mayor', from the German *Bürgermeister,* recorded in the Ukrainian monuments already in XVI century[6] (though in colloquial language it might have existed much earlier). Also the word *мýсити* /musyty/ 'must' can serve as an example; it corresponds to the German *müssen* which also could have existed in Ukrainian already in XIV century having been adopted through the Polish language channel.[7] One can give many more examples on that matter. They show that the Ukrainian equivalents of the German names and terms with *ü* after labial consonants may have orthographic cyrillic *y* and *ю:* those borrowed very long ago are spelled with *y* and those adopted much later are spelled with *ю.*

Such an equivalence is found not only in words in which Ukrainian syllable consisting of a labial (palatalized or non-palatalized) + /u/ (Cyrillic *y*) corresponds to the German syllable consisting of a labial + *ü,* but also in words with a syllable consisting of a non-labial + /u/ (Cyrillic *y*), e.g., there are words such as *гýта* /huta/ 'glass-works', *кýхня* /kuxn'a/ 'kitchen', *кушнір* /kušn'ir/ 'fur-dresser' and others, and words such as *Кюн* /k'un/ (a surname *Kühn*),[7] *кювéтка* /k'uvetka/ (German *Küvette*) 'a small basin', *Тюбінґен* /t'ubingen/ etc.

Гута was borrowed from the German *Hütte* through the Polish channel in XIV cent.[8] In this word *Hü-* corresponds to the Ukrainian *гу-,* (not *гю*) because velars in Ukrainian had always been hard before back vowels /u o/,[9] and the Ukrainian language adapted German *Hü*-to the orthography of the Ukrainian *гу-.*

[4] J.B. Rudnyc'kyj, *An Entymological Dictionary of the Ukrainian Language,* Winnipeg, 1966.

[5] Ibidem.

[6] Ibidem.

[7] A. Brückner, *Słownik etymologiczny języka polskiego,* Warszawa, 1957.

[8] Fr. Sławski, *Słownik etymologiczny języka polskiego,* Krakow, 1966-1969.

[9] In Ukrainian /k g x/ before back vowels were always hard, before /i/ became softened but that softness was not phonemic, and before /e/ they became palatalized by XII century.

A similar fact is found in the correlation between first syllables of the German words *Küche* and *Kürschner* and the first syllables of the Ukrainian words *кухня* and *кушнір*. Both words were adopted from German through Polish already in the XV cent., and these syllables already long ago became "naturalized", so to speak, in the Ukrainian phonetic and phonemic system, whereas *Кюн* and *кювéтка* listed in Holoskevyč's dictionary, with palatalized /k'/, are words which began to be used in Ukrainian relatively late and their first syllables have not yet been integrated into Ukrainian phonetic and phonemic system.

However, in words such as *Tübingen, Nürnberg* etc. German *ü* should be conveyed in Ukrainian by the letter *ю*, that is, these nouns in Ukrainian should be spelled *Тюбінґен* /t'ubingen/, *Нюрнберґ* /n'urnberg/ because Ukrainian non-labial, non-velar and non-postalveolar consonants /t d s z l n c 3/[10] can appear in contrastive pairs palatalized/non-palatalized, and the consonants /t'/ and /n'/ in the above names are palatalized; it means, they are closer to the German *l* and *t* before the German *ü*. Such pairness of the above consonants, palatalized/nonpalatalized, has been in Ukrainian for centuries and therefore their spelling with *ю* has been quite consistent in the Ukrainian literary language. This orthography is consistently reflected in the dictionary by H. Holoskevyč.

In general, we should say that at present the above dictionary appears to be the best one. A list of some corrections would be advisable and would make it even better.

[10] 3 = dz (in spelling).

The Etymology and Semantics of "Kolyvo"-"Kutja"

One of the Christmas customs of the Ukrainian people is the preparation of a twelve-course Christmas Eve dinner of which the main course is *kutja* or *kolyvo*. In this short article I intend to look into the etymology and semantics of these two words.

> *Kolyvo* is derived from the Greek words *kollibon,* pl. *kolliba.* Note: The Old Greek sound [b] in Byzantine epoch (8-9 century) evolved to [v], resulting in the form of kolyvo in Old and Modern Ukrainian.

The basic meaning of the Greek *kolliba* is "cooked grains", mainly "cooked wheat". But besides cooked wheat some other ingredients are also added. According to Sreznevsky, the Latin text related to this matter says: The Greeks slightly boil wheat out, put it into a large jar and add plenty of various fruits, such as pure pease, ground nuts, peeled and finely minced almonds, Corinthian grapes (raisins), grains of Punic pomegranate, and stew all this with parsley leaves. This beautifully and diligently made completeness, which looks like kitchen-garden beds separated from one another, is called *kolliba.* The Greeks prepare this dish usually in honor of a saint, or for a funeral feast, or for the so called "sorokovyny", that is, commemoration of the deceased on the fortieth day after his death. Also they put *kolliba* on the graves of their close relatives and give some to the priest and his assistants (10). (The number in parenthesis here and further indicates the source given in the list of *Sources Used*).

The word *kutja* is derived from the Greek word *kukkion* meaning "grain", pl. *kukkia* "grains".

Note: In this word soft consonant *k'* changed to soft *t'*, hence Old Ukrainian *kutija, kut'ja* and later on *kutja* /kut'a/ (phonemic).

Reflection of the Greek *kukkion* (kukkia) is Old Church Slavic *kutija, kucija* and *kučija,* Russian *kut'ja,* Belorussian *kuc'ja, kuccja, kutja,* Polish *kucja, kut'ja,* Slovenian *kuc-kruh.*

This word appears in Old Ukrainian literary monuments of the 12th century. It is listed in etymological and explanatory dictionaries: Church Slavic, Russian, Ukrainian, Old Church Slavic-Greek-Latin (by Miklosič) and others. Its basic meaning is the same as that of *kolyvo.* The dictionaries checked for this article do not indicate when this word appeared in Ukrainian. However, when we consider that both *kutja* and *kolyvo* are derivatives from the Greek words and Greek Christian ritualism, we may assume that their wide usage in Rus'-Ukraine took place most probably simultaneously with its official Christianization in 988 A.D., or soon after that historical event, that is, at the end of the 10th and the beginning of the 11th century. As far as the content of these two words is concerned, there is no substantial difference between them. Here are definitions and quotations:

KUTJA. It is a dish of rice or other peeled grains, with honey or raisins, served at funerals and funeral repasts: "At the Mass for the dead they always took with them *kutja* on the white plate, in a napkin, and *kutja* was sweet; it was prepared from rice and raisins, the latter being pressed into the rice with a cross" (Dostojevsky, *Prestuplenie i nakazanie* 'Crime and Punishment' (11)); porridge of peeled barley, wheat or rice, brought to Church at funeral repasts and later on consumed; in some places people eat *kutja* on Christmas Eve (12). A similar definition is given in other dictionaries.

KOLYVO. It is a cooked wheat, seasoned with honey and sweet berries (7, 8); *kutja* served at funeral repast (5); wheat porridge or rice with raisins and sweet sauce: "If only there were pikelets and *kolyvo* with syta (=water malted with honey)!; at the funeral feast man would taste them with pleasure (Hulak Artemovs'kyj, *Bajky* 'Tales', ed. 1958, p. 128). "At the window there was *kolyvo-kutja* and sweetened water for

the Oloforov's soul" (Dončenko, O.V., v. 2, ed. 1956, p. 108 (14)).

As one can see, there is no semantic difference between *kolyvo* and *kutja*. However, *kutja* is listed in all etymological and explanatory dictionaries indicated above, and *kolyvo* is listed in all Ukrainian dictionaries and in older Russian dictionaries, but is not listed in Russian dictionaries published in the USSR.

The words *kolyvo* and *kutja* most probably existed as parallel words with the same meaning in Kyjivan Rus'-Ukraine for a relatively long time and later on they were borrowed by Moscovites-Russians. In Ukraine (and also in Russia due to Ukraine's influence) there was a competition, so to speak, between these two words for a domination in the usage, and *kutja* became the winner both in Ukraine and in Russia, and *kolyvo* became an entry of a passive vocabulary. In addition, *kutja* underwent a semantic narrowing in Ukrainian. At present, it means "peeled cooked wheat with admixture of ground poppy-seeds, nuts and honey sauce". It is served only at Christmas Eve and at Epiphany Eve, and not at a funeral feast (after the burial of the deceased) not at the feast commemorating the 40th day of the deceased's death (which used to be the custom of the Greeks, and it still may be practiced in Greece at present, and of the Ukrainian people in their ancient historical period).

The grains and honey in *kutja* have an allegorical meaning according to St. Paul's first epistle to Corinthians (X, 36-36) and evangelist John (XII, 24): Like the grain which decays in the earth arises in new sprouts, so does the body of the dead buried in the earth. It decays, but will arise from the dead and live. The honey in *kutja* symbolizes sweetness (delights) of the future eternal life.

SOURCES USED

1. Von Miklosich, Franz, *Lexicon Paleoslovenico-Graeco-Latinum,* 8th ed., Wien, 1963.
2. Pavlenkov, F., *Encyklopedičeskij slovar',* 5th ed., S-Peterburg, 1913.
3. Preobraženskij, A.H., *Etimologičeskij slovar' russkogo jazyka,* Moskva, 1959.

4. Šanskij, N.M., *Etimologičeskij slovar' russkogo jazyka,* Moskva, 1982.
5. Fasmer, Maks, *Etimologičeskij slovar' russkogo jazyka,* Moskva, 1967.
6. Andreevskij, I.E., and others, *Encyklopedičeskij slovar',* S-Peterburg, 1896.
7. Petkovič, Sava, *Rečnik cerkovnoslovenskogo jezuka,* Sremski Karlovici, 1935.
8. Imperatorskaja Akademija Nauk, *Slovar' cerkovno-slavjanskago i russkago jazyka,* S-Peterburg, 1867.
9. Sadnik, L. und Aitzenmüller, R., *Handwörterbuch zu den altkirchenslavischen Texten,* Heidelberg, 1955.
10. Sreznevskij, I.I., *Materialy dlja slovarja drevnerusskogo jazyka,* Moskva, 1956.
11. AN SSSR, *Slovar' russkogo jazyka,* 2nd ed., Moskva, 1983.
12. Dal, V., *Tolkovyj slovar' žyvogo velikorussogo jazyka,* Moskva, 1956.
13. Ušakov, D.N., *Tolkovyj slovar' russkogo jazyka,* Moskva, 1935.
14. AN URSR, *Slovnyk ukrajins'koji movy,* Kyjiv, 1973.
15. Andrusyshen, C.H., and Krett, J.N., *Ukrainian-English Dictionary,* Toronto, 1957.
16. *Oxford Latin Dictionary,* Oxford, 1968, 1976.
17. AN URSR, Il'jin, V.S., Dorošenko, K.P., Levčenko, S.P. and others, *Ukrajins'ko-rosijs'kyj slovnyk,* Kyjiv, 1965.
18. Kuzelja, Z., Rudnyc'kyj, Ja., *Ukrajins'ko-nimec'kyj slovnyk,* Leipzig, 1943.

The Effect of Ivan Franko's World View On His Aesthetic Principles[1]

Soviet investigators of Ivan Franko's literary works assert that their aesthetics is materialistic; that it could not be different, because it followed Franko's materialistic world view. Wherever they find it suitable, they confuse the notion of the world view in its proper meaning with the notion of aesthetics, or take out of the context certain phrases and word-combinations and attempt to adjust them to their 'a priori' assertions. This has been done, for instance, by O.G. Bilous,[2] M. Klymas',[3] M.N. Parxomenko,[4] I. Dorošenko,[5] I. Stebun[6] and others.

Here are quotations from Franko's verses on which Bilous based his statements:

> "And spirit? This is just a sparkle,
> A small fire, motion of the nerves!
> If the brain falls apart, then this fire
> Will be extinguished, the spirit will die."[7]

[1] In this paper the scientific transliteration of Cyrillic is used.

[2] O. H. Bilous, *Svitohlajad Ivana Franka,* Kyjiv, 1956.

[3] M. Klymas' *Svitohljad Ivana Franka,* Kyjiv, 1959.

[4] M. N. Parxomenko, *Ėstetičeskie vzgljady Ivana Franko,* Moscow, 1966.

[5] I. Dorošenko, *Ivan Franko — literaturnyj krytyk,* L'viv, 1966.

[6] I. Stebun, *Pytannja realizmu v estetyci Ivana Franka,* Kyjiv, 1958.

[7] O. H. Bilous, ..., p. 24 *(Tvory v dvadcjaty tomax,* t. X. s. 33). From now on only the number of the volume and of the page of this source in parenthesis will be indicated. The item listed in parenthesis indicates the original source quoted by the author whose name is listed before the parenthesis.

According to Franko, only matter-nature is eternal, Bilous says, and quotes Franko's lines:

> "The soul is eternal! It shall live forever!
> That is a terrible thought, wild imagination."[8]

According to Bilous, "Franko was an atheist, irreconcilable to religion, mystycism, superstititions, clergimen and machinations of the Vatican;"[9] that he "believed in materialistic monism," that is, he believed that "the universe and man are grounded not on two different bases — spirit and manner —, but on one only, that is, on material basis."[10] By these and similar phrases the Soviet authors usually distort Franko's world view.

They try to support their statements by the knowledge that Franko was familiar with Marxism, that he even translated the twenty fourth chapter of Marx's *Capital*, that he not only participated in the socialist movement in Galicia, but also was its leader, that he considered revolution as the only solution of the painful social-political conflicts and that he incited the lower classes to active revolution. All this, they say, derived from the poet's materialistic world view. So his literary works, as a means of expression of this world view, and of harsh economic and social-political problems, had to be manifested in materialistic aesthetics. In other words, they claim, Franko was a materialist in the basic philosophical meaning and his literary aesthetics is materialistic. Into this rigid frame they try to squeese Franko, the great poet, writer and thinker.

However, such claims are tendentious. Franko's basic world view was idealistic. This idealistic basis was developed in his personality by his mother during his childhood and his boyhood, by his education and his upbringing, by church and through biblical literature. With this basis in his nature he entered the University of Lviv, where he believed that the seed of the ideal world existed in the human being at the moment of birth, and that this need was "the divine spark." In his verse

[8] Ibidem.

[9] Ibidem.

[10] Ibidem, p. 23; also: Parxomenko, ..., p. 87 (*Svit*, 1882, No. 4-5, p. 303).

Bozes'kist' ljuds'koho duxa (Human Spirit Is God-like) Franko said: "Our spirit born from yours, tied with you for good, is a lasting fire forever: spirit's creative power and love."[11]

In time, Franko familiarized himself with socialistic slogans. Drahomanov's appeal to the youth to work for the Ukrainian people, who lived in miserable economic and social-political conditions, stimulated the young poet to such work. Concepts of human socialism seemed to him most suitable for the materialization of Drahomanov's appeal at that time, and he began to put these concepts into effect. On that road he encountered strong opposition from foreigners and from some leaders of his own people who did not wish to admit the poor living conditions of their people and did not try to help them. In this passionate and intense fight, Franko subjected himself to some influence of rationalism. As a result, sometimes questions disturbed him about matter and spirit, about immortality of the human soul etc., as they often occur to gifted individuals who seek the truth. This meditation was expressed by Franko in the lines quoted above. However, these were only sporadic doubts in certain moments of the poet's life. The idealistic basis of his world view, though tested by materialistic-rationalistic experimentation, was never destroyed. Even in that period one can find often in his works the word "soul" used in its proper meaning. In one of his narratives about prisoners' lives, while comparing the lowest strata of society with the lowest parts of the sea, Franko speaks of the supernatural power as a source of life: "It probably is hard and melancholy for those lower depths of water to be just slightly visible and to stiffen endlessly on the dead bottom in the terrible darkness, under unparalleled pressure, among dead bodies only. It is hard and sad for them, especially when the *eternal indestructable power* resounds in them; power, which is hidden in them, and without which no atom exists in nature. The living indestructable power inside, and darkness all around."...[12]

[11] Nicholas Wacyk, *Ivan Franko: His Thoughts and Struggles*, New York, 1975. p. 20 (*Druh*, 1875).

[12] Oleksander Hruševs'kyj, "Ivan Franko" in *Literaturno-naukovyj visnyk* (=LNV), v. XXXIX, 1907, p. 32.

In time, toward the end of the 80' and in the 90's, Franko shook off much of his rationalistic-materialistic influences, and the elements of his idealistic view began more apparent, particularly when his creative mind was transferred from the burning questions of the life of his people, suppressed and neglected. In his poem *Smert' Kajina* (The Death of Cain, 1899), based on the biblical plot, Franko glorified love and feeling as a source of life, whose creator is God: "Feeling and love! We have them in us! Their mighty seed lives in everybody's heart. One has just to cherish it and cultivate it and it will flourish! That means, the source of life is in us, and there is no need of hunting for a paradise to seek it there. *O my God!* Can it really be! Have you not just jested as a father jokes with children, when, expelling us from paradise, yet you put that paradise in our hearts to accompany us on our journey?"

Besides the physiological functions of our brain neurones, Franko supported the existence of the synthetic sense, which he identified with the notion of the *soul.* In his thesis "Iz sekretiv poetyčnoji tvorčosty" (From the Secrets of Poetic Creativity) he writes: "Our organism is not a receptive apparatus only. Besides senses supplying us the impressions of the external world, we possess organs of our own inner activity not quite dependent on sense impulses, though inddissolubly connected with the nature of the organism. The collective name of all these manifestations of the inner organ is "the soul." We distinguish several main manifestations of spiritual life: memory...conscience...feeling...imagination ...will..."[13].

It might be that in this respect Franko was influenced to some extent by Wilheim M. Wundt's book *Grundzüge der physiologischen Psychologie*. This book, whose author was proffesor of philosophy in the University of Leipzig, must have been the authoritative university textbook at that time if one takes into consideration the fact that it appeared in five editions within nine years, that is, 1893-1902. In the introductory section of this book "The Problem of Physiological Psychology" Wundt was opposed to the materialistic pseudo-science in the field of psychology and interpreted the essence and correlation of the

[13] M. Klymas', ..., p. 198.

soul and spirit: "The assertion thet mental life lacks all causal connection, and that the real and primary object of psychology is therfore not the mental life itself but the physical substrata of thet life, — this essertion stands selfcondemned. The effects of such teaching upon psychology cannot be but detrimental... Hence the gravest danger that besets science today comes not from the speculative and empirical dogmas of the older schools, but rather from this materialistic pseudo-science. Antipsychological tendences can hardly find clearer expression than in the statement that the psychological interpretation of the mental life has no relation whatever to the mental life itself, as manifested in history and in society."[14] "Consciousness always and everywhere points to internal expirience as a special source of knowledge." "The concept of 'soul' covers the whole field of internal experience."[15] "Mind (=Seele) is the subject of the inner experience as conditioned by its connection with an external existence; spirit =Geist) is the same subject without reference to such connection."[16] No matter what correlation between 'the soul' and 'the spirit' would be, they supplement one another and comprise a synthesis of the psychological whole of the human being and establish their primacy in relationship to matter. Franko believed in this primacy throughout his life. Only during the poet's experimentation with socialistic ideas was this belief suppressed by his rationalistic-materialistic evaluation 'of the burning problems of the day' of his people and by his desire to solve these problems.

Franko's belief in this primacy was reflected in his masterpiece *Mojsej* (Moses, 1905), conception of which had been matured for many years, at least from the end of the 90's. In it, Franko appeared a romanticist, and not a rationalist-materialist. Analysing this poem, S. Hajevs'kyj said that Franko "through the thickets and jungle of the spiritual quest came to Christ..."[17] "...repelled the evil spirit of scepticism and

[14] Wilheim Max Wundt, *Grundzüge der physiologischen Psychologie,* 5 ed., Leipzig, 1902. Translated by Edward Bradford Titchener, *Principles of Physiological Psychology,* v. 1, London-New York, 1910, pp. 10-11.

[15] Ibidem, p. 17.

[16] Ibidem, p. 21.

[17] S. Hajevs'kyj, *Frankiv "Mojsej",* UVAN, 1948, p. 11.

reconciled with God; the darkness disappeared, the good overcame the evil, the materialistic world view gave place to the ideally pure and high understanding of existence."[18] As to Hajevs'kyj's thought one correction should be made, namely, *not* "the materialistic *world view* gave place...", but "materialistic *layers* on Franko's idealistic world view gave place...", because, as has been said, the basis of the poet's world view was idealistic.

Writing about his poem *Moses* Franko said that in it "the sharpening of the conflict between the prophet and the people is shown; the sharpening which led to the local break and in further development of the action through the series of temptations and revelations to a direct contact and union of the human being with the *highest being, Jehova*."[19] In the same poem Franko warned the young generation:

> "He who will gain all treasures of the earth
> And will grow fond of them more than of anything else,
> Will become a slave of these treasures,
> Will lose treasures of his spirit."

The poet seems to hear God's words directed to the real champions of the priority of spiritual values:

> "He who will feed you on bread,
> With bread shall go to dung,
> But he who will feed your spirit,
> Will fuse himself with me."

Thus, Franko was not an atheist, a man with a materialistic world view. He believed in a supernatural power and in the primacy of the spirit over matter. The foundation of the idealistic world view laid in his soul in his youth was carried by him to the grave.[20]

[18] Ibidem, p. 14.

[19] Jurij Shevelov, *Ivan Franko. Mojsej. Poza meži možlyvoho,* New York, 1968, p. 7.

[20] As for Franko's religiousness, one should distinguish its two aspects: inner religious, which is belief in supernatural power, God, with recognition of primacy of the spirit over the matter; and external religious, that it, belonging to a church organization and carrying out practices imposed by the church. Regarding the first aspect, we should say that Franko was a religious man as has been proven above. Concerning, the second aspect, Franko was not religious because he believed that clergy got along with the sup-

In order to support their description of Franko as a materialist and antiidealist and, along with this, as a materialistic aesthetician, the Soviet publicists and critics refer to his socialistic views. Yet they themselves admit, though reluctantly, that Franko's socialism never reached the level characteristic of the doctrine of Marx and Engels and that this "deficiency" was caused by the West-European revisionistic theories, such as the theory of La Salle,[21] Bebel,[22] and others.[23] These theories, they say, had influence on Franko.

One cannot deny that these theories influenced Franko's social-

pressors of his people. It comes of his words about Ivan Vyšenskyj: "He (Vyšensk'kyj) grieved at the fact that those bishops treated their subjects of one faith, orthodox or greek-catholics, in the same way as Polish noblemen did and in the same way exploited them and held them in distress. And he was the first one in our country who sharply and bravely raised his voice in the defense of those working people and showed to the noblemen and bishops that the peasant was their brother, and not a plain working beast, that he rejoiced and suffered as a man and wanted to live like a man." (XVI, 425. According to I. Dorošenko, *Ivan Franko — literaturnyj krytyk,* p. 124.) Along with this Franko glorified Vyšens'kyj, the eminent ascetic and polemicist.

In many of his articles Franko also favorably spoke of the priest and poet Markijan Šaškevyč, e.g., "The spirit of Šaškevyč's poetry was new, fresh and original: new was its individual, subjective character, which enables us in each of his works, in each verse to see the poet's personality, his sympathetic nature and sincere heart." (XVII, 227. According to I. Dorošenko, ..., p. 116.) Favorably and with sympathy was presented the priest in Franko's poem *Pans'ki žarty* (The Nobleman's Jokes).

[21] La Salle was an enemy of Marxism. he was against revolution and the class war of the German people, understood the state as above class, a political-national organization in which there would be a general suffrage and possibilities for the organization of industrial associations. He was against the participation of the German workers in political struggle of the European proletariat.

[22] Bebel could also have had some influence on Franko by his opinion that the state should be an above class national organization. Franko himself indicated that he was influenced by these two theoreticians in his article "Jak se stalosja" (How It Happened. According to M. Klymas', ..., p. 70).

[23] Franko was also familiar with Fabian socialism in England, French social-federalism and German revisionism. Fabian socialism was against class war, proletarian revolution and dictatorship of the proletariat and was in favor of the evolutionary rooting of capitalism into socialism. (Ivan Franko's translation of the George Bernard Show's Particle in *Žytje i slovo*, 1897. According to M. Klymas', ..., p. 70.) The French socialists-federalists negated dialectal-materialism, rejected Marxian ideology about the concentration of capital, about the state, etc. Views of the German revisionists also differed from those of Marxists.

political views, because he himself spoke of them as being "worthy of attention" in his article "Socijalizm i socijal-demokratyzm" (Socialism and Social-Democratism, 1897),[24] and he never became Marxist. Yet, he never became a Marxian doctrinaire not because he could not grasp the depth of Marxian ideology, as the Soviet investigators say, but just the opposite: it happened because Franko grasped the depth of dialectal-materialism very well, and he understood and visualized its results. He knew that the proletarian revolution and the dictatorship of the proletariat would deprive the individual of the possiblity of the development of his intellectual and spiritual resources, would create an artificial exploiting state machine in which the individual would function only as a small automatic wheel, a powerless object and not as a free subject and object. In his article "Do istoriji socijalstyčnoho ruxu" (On the History of the Socialistic Movement) he said: "The program of state socialism has too often an odor of state despotism and uniformity, which, if it were in fact put into practice, would become a great hindrance to progress or a source of a new revolution."[25]

Thus, though for some period of time in his life Franko was attracted by socialistic ideas, thinking at that specific time they might have served his people better than any other ideas, he was against what is essential in Marxism. He was against the proletarian revolution and the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat. He was against inflaming hatred among the classes, against a class war, against sapping the roots of the life of the national organism. His socialism was identical with his endeavors to remove the economic, social, political and national injustices of his people to secure for them freedom and liberty and to extend freedom and liberty to all mankind without violence and bloody revolution. He was a democratic reformist, a constructive evolutionist, rather than a revolutionist as was stated correctly by Leonid Rudnytzky.[26]

In pursuing these ideals, Franko chose the road of realism in his

[24] M. Klymas', ..., p. 72.
[25] Nicholas Wacyk, ..., p. 73 (*LNV*, 1904, p. 151).
[26] Leonid Rudnytzky, *Ivan Franko i nimec'ka literatura,* München, 1974, p. 202.

literary creativity after the period of his leaning toward romanticism. Yet one does find manifestations of the poet's basic idealistic world view with materialistic layers on it, thicker or thinner, depending on the subject involved. And speaking of the subject that is the topic of Franko's literary works and articles, one must refer to the economic, social and political life of the Ukrainian people at that time. Though serfdom was officially abolished on Franko's land, that is, in Galicia, in 1848, the miserable conditions of the peasants' and the industrial workers' life did not change. The new exploiters, oil industrialists, started buying up peasants' land, woods, cattle etc., because of the peasants' backwardness and imprudence. Economic poverty, spiritual obscurity and lack of education enveloped the villages. These conditions of life were also reflected in the external appearance of the villages. In Franko's narrative *Perexresni stežky* (Cross-Roads) one reads: "Villages are poor, grey, with ugly willows by the road. Orchards spring around, marshy community pastures, ragged edges of thatched roofs, crumbling fences here and there." Having become landless, many peasants moved to the towns to work in industry. There their situation became even worse: unusually hard and unsanitary work conditions, poor pay, bad food, drunkenness, illnesses, no social security, no insurance whatsoever. The sad and depressing life of prisoners received Franko's close attention too, e.g., in the narrative *Na dni* (At the Bottom), *Do svitla* (To the Light).

Portraying such life of peasants, industrial workers and prisoners in his narratives and verses, Franko put aesthetic aspects of this portrayal on the second level and concentrated on the content of reality and its depiction. These are found in narratives such as *Dva pryjateli* (Two Friends), *Lesysyna čeljad'* (The Lesysyn Family), *Sam sobi vynen* (It Was His Own Fault), *Lisy i pasovys'ka* (Woods and Pastures), *Dobryj zarobok* (Good Earning), *Na roboti* (At Work), *Ripnyk* (The Oil-Worker), *Vuhljar* (The Charcoal-Burner), *Navernenyj hrisnyk* (The Confessed Sinner), *Boa constrictor* and others. These works, most of them of the 80's, were motivated by "the need of the day" and their aesthetics is utilitarian. Also, utilitarian aesthetics characterizes Franko's works of the 90's, such as *Zvirjačyj bjudzet* (The Animal Budget), *Svyns'ka konstytucija* (The Swine Constitution), *Kazka pro dobrobut*

(A Tale about Prosperity), *Istorija kozuxa* (History of the Sheepskin Coat), *Perexresni stezky* (The Cross-Roads) and others. They represent Franko's literary reactions to the critical questions of the time.

Besides writing original narratives and verses of this kind, Franko, led by the same motivation, made translations of German authors such as F. Freligrath, G. Herwegh, N. Lenau, J. Popper-Lynkeus and others. These works concerned mainly with the social-didactic principles.[27]

During that period of Franko's attraction to socialistic concepts he did not follow the slogans of "Art for Art's Sake" and Beauty for Beauty's Sake." According to Franko's view of the purpose of literature, these slogans allowed no room for the depiction of reality, both its positive and negative sides. In his opinion, literature should primarily serve the people by raising them to a higher educational, cultural and sociopolitical level, by making them aware of their social situation, by evoking their feeling of human dignity and human rights, by inspiring them to struggle for such dignity and rights.

Franko's first comments on literature and aesthetics are found in his article "Literaturni pys'ma" (The Literary Writings), published in *Druh:* "Criticism which treats science only 'for the sake of science' as well as criticism which considers art and its ideals as its highest goals —this now yields to social criticism in which life and its conditions present the highest goal of art and science."[28]

In his article, "Literatura, jizji zavdannja i najvažniši cixy" (Literature, Its Task and Most Important Features) Franko said: "Literature and life ought to be closely connected."[29] "Literature of a certain time should be a picture of life, work, talks and thoughts of that time."[30] "It should reveal the very roots of good and evil in the existing order and produce among inteligentsia people who would be ready to do everything in their power to support the good aspects of life and remove the bad ones, — subsequently to bringing the intelligentsia closer to the

[27] Ibidem, p. 198.
[28] I. Dorošenko, ..., p. 16 (*Druh*, 1876, No. 19, p. 302.
[29] M.N. Parxomenko, ..., p. 88.
[30] Ibidem, p. 89.

people and support the striving for and serving of the people's interests. Without the cultural and progressive goal literature will become a worthless plaything of the intelligentsia, needed by no one, serving no one's good, and will be suitable, perhaps, only for the entertainment of the wealthy after a good meal."[31]

Since art, according to Franko, should serve the people's needs, he struggled for the proper theater too, which in his opinion, "should be a school of life." "It should depict and analyze life's phenomena, should arose the feeling that one phenomenon is good and the other is bad, should evoke in the audience sound criticism."[32] Criticism ought to be thorough. Theater which "subjects to public criticism only some unimportant shortcomings and leaves out or covers up main, fundamental shortcomings of society, will never become fully national, will not be a school of life or will be a bad school."[33]

Nevertheless, Franko did not depreciate literary aesthetics as such even during his experimentation with socialism. In his letter to Pavlyk (July 30, 1879) he wrote: "I do not intend to create masterpieces, do not care for a perfect form etc. not because it is not a nice thing in itself, but because the main thing for us now is thought itself. The main task of the writer is to put in the reader's hand a book, to arouse his interest, to move him, to evoke thought in his mind."[34]

Thus, applying the utilitarian approach to his literary works, Franko expressed his positive opinion about literary aesthetics as such too, but he did too consider it of primary importance. The most significant for him seemed to be an ideational content presented in realistic manner.

But, as has been said, aesthetic aspect as such of literary creativity was in the scope of Franko's attention too. So, for instance, in his article "Pol's'kyj seljanyn v osvitlenni pol's'koji literatury" Franko gave favorable evaluation of Boleslaw Prus' *Forpost*. In this novel the atten-

[31] Ibidem, p. 125 (*Soč. v 10 tomax* (volumes); v. 9, p. 58.

[32] Ibidem, p. 126 (*Narod,* L'viv, 1892, No. 9, p. 124).

[33] Ibidem, p. 126.

[34] Leonid Rudnytzky, ..., pp. 198-199 (XX, 79).

tion was focused on the leading images and characters, as well as on the writer's artistic perfection. Franko said: "But this artistic perfection, based on the bringing together of all fractions and mixed numbers to the whole numbers, on the simplification of all psychological problems, often unusually complicated, evokes some doubts which can be expressed in the question: didn't the author sacrifice too much of the psychological and social aspect of the work for the sake of the achievement of artistic plasticity?"[35] Thus, Franko required a balanced combination of both sides in an artistic work, that is, artistic perfection and ideational content, the latter being in most cases a social-psychological content.

Leaning toward the understanding of such two-fold purpose of the literary work, Franko made many translations of German classics: "Works such as *Das Hildebrandslied, Das Nibelungenlied*, Goethe's works and works of other classics, in which ideational concept and aesthetic beauty are harmoniously combined and which are everlasting documents of human culture in general, were translated by Franko not only because of their ideological-didactic or historic significance, but also because of their aesthetic values."[36] In general, it should be indicated that West-European cultural trends, and particularly those of German poets and writers of the classic-romanatic period, such as Lessing, Herder, Goethe, Theodor Fischer, Schiller and others had influence on the formation of Franko's aesthetic views.

Franko's attention was considerably attractedby the rôle of the subjective in relation to the objective in the ideational artistic work, the latter being distinguished from an ordinary tendentious work. In his article "Lesja Ukrajinka (1900) Franko said: "The best works of Lesja Ukrajinka are ideational and not tendentious." "What is the difference?" he asked. He answered himself: "The difference lies in that a tendentatious poet wants to prove a social-political or, in general, a theoretical thesis. For this purpose he picks up poetical images as illustrations of the text. But the illustrations, even if they are good, remain only illustrations to the explanation of the text. They do not make the work a

[35] I. Dorošenko, ..., p. 76 (XVIII, 155).
[36] Leonid Rudnytzky, ..., p. 198.

genuine artistic creation. It cannot achieve what genuine poetry can. The reader's heart remains indifferent."[37] In contrast to this stands an ideational artistic work. "I call poetic work ideational when at its base there is a living image, fact, impression, or feeling of the author. By going deeply with his imagination into this image, the author contours it, illuminates it from various sides and tries with all means provided for him by poetic technique to project it as much as possible in the same form, with the same force and the same coloring into the mind of the reader. Going deeply with his imagination into this image, the author attempts to exclude from it everything occasional and to select everything typical, ideational. Of course, his poetic portraying will also aims at giving the reader this deeper ideational base of the living image. Poetic technique, leaning on the psychological laws of perception and association tells us that this can be achieved best of all by the simplest means, combinations of concrete images, but composed in such a way as to touch upon our innermost sensibilities to open to us a wide horizon of feelings and worldly relations. Without the hidden harmony the poet can draw very beautiful and picturesque images, but they will not leave deep traces in our soul, they will pass like incidentally heard anecdotes, though these anecdotes might sometimes be successfully composed. We say of such works that they give us cool feeling. A real poet is he who, by drawing concrete and bright pictures, simultaneously is able to touch upon those veiled sensibilities which sound only in the moments of our own immediate happiness or grief. The poet possesses the key to the treasurehouse of our deepest sensations. He awakens in our soul such forces and impulses that without him they could slumber forever or rise only in some unusual moments. The poet enriches our soul with affections, mighty and free from the mixture of the trivial round of life, our fits of egotism. He makes us citizens of a higher, lofty world. And this is the ideational content of the poet's works."[38] And this is poetic beauty. It consists in that "hidden harmony" created by the poet through means of his deep psychological experience during the

[37] M.N. Parxomenko, ..., p. 120 (IX, 338-339).
[38] Ibidem, pp. 120-121.

process of creation. This view is reflected in Franko's poem *Čym pisnja žyva* (What Makes a Song Alive? 1884):

> "Each line of every song
> Was part of my own brain,
> The thoughts, they were my nerves,
> The sounds were my heart's pain.
> What moved that sound of yours
> Was my own heartfelt grief;
> What throbbed within the song
> Were tears which brought relief.
> For this my soul is strung
> Like strings upon a heart,
> Each passing touch, each blow
> Wakes tones now soft, now sharp."[39]

The ideational content of the artistic work, that is content penetrated and enriched by the poet's sensations, feelings and imagination, is the essence of the ideational harmony which provides spiritual beauty.

After expressing his view in the above lengthy part of his article about Lesja Ukraijinka, Franko concludes as follows: "Poetic beauty is not a beauty of poetic form only, nor is it the accumulation of certain aesthetic and delicate images, nor a combination of sensational words. All these components create a real beatuy only if they are parts of a higher unity, a spiritual beauty, ideational harmony. Here, as in every realm of human creativity, the main, decisive moment is precisely the soul, individuality, the poet's feeling.[40] Thus, labeling Franko as opponent of subjectivism and individualism in literary creativity by the Soviet investigators of Franko's literary heritage is false.[41]

These investigators usually base their statements on Franko's expression that "criticism should be scholarly," which means, they say, that Franko was opposed to subjective criticism and subsequently he was against subjectivism in literary creativity. It is true that in the Ger-

[39] Translator: Percival Cundy, *Ivan Franko, Selected Poems,* New York, 1948, p. 127. (The word "soft" in the last line of the verse substitutes for the word "sweet" of Cundy's translation.)

[40] Leonid Rudnytzky, ..., p. 200 (XVII, 255).

[41] e.g., AN URSR, *Istorija ukrajins'koji literatury,* v.1, Kyjiv, 1955, p. 515.

man weekly *Zeit* Franko criticized those critics who were "entirely subjective," who wrote whatever and however they wished, ignoring completely any scholarly approach. Regarding this he said: "Needless to say that such criticism is at best stylistic exercises... and does not fulfill what it should fulfill."[42] However, Franko's comments on literary criticism were not intended to deprive either the author or the critic of their subjective views. Franko just required that such subjective elements be not limited exclusively to the author's personal mood, but that it have a "broader horizon." In one of his letters to the young woman poet, Klementia Popovyč, Franko said: "From your poems only "In Winter" can be printed in its reworked version, the others have only subjective value, for yourself, because they express exclusively your personal mood without any broader horizon."[43]

Franko's aesthetic view, indicated above, is reflected in his masterpieces *Smert' Kajina* (The Death of Cain, 1889), *Mojsej* (Moses, 1905) and *Ivan Vyšens'kyj* (1900). It is found also in the narrative *Pid oborohom* (Under the Stack), *Teren u nozi* (The Thorn in the Foot) and others. The aesthetics of these works is far from materialistic, a term in the frame of which the Soviet authors try to compress all the literary works of Franko.

Toward the end of 90's and afterward, Franko began to understand aesthetics as the teaching of feeling, especially feeling of artistic beauty, which means that he began to consider it strictly a part of psychology.[44] In the light of this understanding he required that literary criticism discuss "only literary and artistic problems" and not "political, social or religious.".[45] That means, literary criticism should be first of all aesthetic. In his thesis "From the Secrets of Poetic Creativity" Franko said: "Literary criticism should be, in my opinion, first of all aesthetic, which

[42] M.N. Parxomenko, ..., p. 170 (*LNV*, v.1, p. 21).

[43] I. Dorošenko, ..., p. 75 (XX, 267).

[44] According to the Soviet authors, Franko's shift from the social area to psychological was influenced by Wundt's *Principles of Physiological Psychology*. This probably was true, but it might also be to a great extent the influence of the German aestheticians and Franko's own meditations.

[45] M.N. Parxomenko, ..., p. 206 (*LNV*, v. 1, pp. 24-25).

means, it is part of psychology and must use those methods in scholarly investigation which are used in modern psychology."[46] The discussion of social problems by Dobroljubov in his critical articles now was considered by Franko the main shortcoming of these articles, though previously such articles were favorably evaluated by Franko.

Franko's view that literary criticism should first of all deal with aesthetic values was reflected in his article "Juvilej Ivana Levyc'koho (Nečuja)" (The Jubilee of Ivan Levyc'kyj (Nečuj), 1905), in which he favorably portrayed the writer artist without including in the portrayal Ivan Levyc'kyj as a citizen: "Ivan Levyc'kyj is a great artist of sight, a gigantic, omnipercipient eye of Ukraine. This eye embraces no masses, or general contours; it embraces individuals, but it embraces them with incomparable quickness and accuracy, can immediately pick up their characteristic features and transmit them to us with that prominence and freshness of colours in which it sees them itself. The thinker, a conscientious artist, with minute steps follows the directions of that clear sight, tries now more less successfully to group and deep the material furnished by sight. But sight, visual impressions, usually predominate, and the artist sometimes will just stop and admire these figures, photographed with his eyes in all their motions and situations."[47] As one can see, here Levyc'kyj is portrayed favorably only as an artist.

Further in that article about Levyc'kyj Franko wrote: "Such characters left alone by the artist are everlasting peasant women Paraska sand Palažka, the characters in *Kajdaševa simja* (The Kajdaš Family), the townsman Lemiška in Xmary (The Clouds) and many others in the large gallery of types, depicted by the person whose jubilee we are celebrating. Do not ask what they want, what their ideational background is, why the author exposed them, what he wished to express or prove through them; nothing at all. They live, and that's all. They live their own individual life, and the author, having observed that life, could not help admiring its manifestations as a botanist cannot help rejoicing when finds a rare, luxurious plant in its full bloom. He stops by it, looks

[46] I. Dorosenko, ..., p. 173 (XVI, 258).
[47] Ibidem, p. 193.

closely at all its parts and vital organs, watches their functions and every time he notices something interesting, characteristic, typical, his eyes start sparkling and his lips involuntarily whisper "A šyk!' And he enriches his album by a new specimen."[48] Here again, Levyc'kyj the artist was separated in the portrayal from Levyc'kyj the citizen.

The assertion of Soviet scholars, publicists and critics that Franko's aesthetics was purely materialistic (except for his "erroneous" change in 90's) because it was influenced by his basic materialistic world view is not correct. Franko's basic world view was idealistic. He believed in the primacy of the spirit. This belief was the motivation of his oul throughout his life, now more now less covered with materialistic-rationalistic layers in his fight against backwardness and social-political injustice and in his efforts to lead his people to a better future. This fight and these efforts conditioned the subject of his literary works and their aesthetics. This was mainly during the period of Franko's attraction to socialistic ideas which seemed to him at that time to be most promising way of solving his people's problems. Therefore, most of Franko's literary and scholarly works of that period were characteristic for their ideational contents, with realistic presentation and utilitarian aesthetics. According to him, literary criticism should apply this approach to the analysis of the values of a literary work.

Later on, toward the end of the 90's and afterward, Franko shifted his attention more to the psychological aspects of the literary works and gave his preference to them rather than to social aspects. He expressed this view mainly in his thesis "From the Secrets of Poetic Creativity" and in the article "Lesja Ukrajinka." This view was reflected in his poems *The Death of Cain, Moses, Ivan Vyšens'kyj* and others. Along with stressing psychological aspect as an important value of a literaryy work, he also emphasized its aesthetic features, and even gave preference to them by saying that "literary criticism should be first of all aesthetic" (see Note 46). In his article "Jubilee of Ivan Levyc'kyj (Nečuj)" Franko favorably spoke of this writer as of an artist and separated him

[48] Ibidem.

in this respect from Ivan Levyc'kyj (Nečuj) a citizen which brought him the accusations of the Soviet critics.

Concluding, I would like to quote Franko's words, which he said three years before his death (1913): "In my almost forty years of literary activity I went through various stages of development, held different jobs, served different trends and peoples, wrote a lot, because I had to work a lot, besides in Ukrainian, also in Polish, German and Russian. But everywhere and always I had one leading thought — to serve the interests of my people and the human progressive ideas common to all mankind. I have been faithful, it seems to me, to these two leading stars so far, and shall remain faithful to them for the rest of my life."[49] And we must say that by saturating his works with deep ideational-psychological contents and by accompanying them with corresponding aesthetics Franko made an everlasting contribution to these two concepts united by that one leading thought throughout his life. By this contribution Franko did not want to remove heaven from his nation and mankind nor separate his nation and mankind from heaven. He wanted to bring them closer to one anther. And he did.

AUXILIARY BIBLIOGRAPHY

Andrusyšen, C.H, Kirkconnell, W., *The Ukrainian Poets 1189-1962*, University of Toronto Press, 1963.

Bilova, V.S., Kondel', P.G., *Xrestomatija z ukrajinsk'koji literatury*, L'viv, 1964.

Briegleb, Klaus, *Ästhetische Sittlichkeit*, Tübingen, 1962.

Cyževs'kyj (=Chyzhevs'kyi), Dmytro. *A History of Ukrainian Literature from 11th to the End of the 19th Century*, Littleton, 1975.

Čexovyč, Kostjantyn, "Postat' Ivana Vyšens'koho i Mojseja v tvorčosti Ivana Franka," *Slovo*, 4, 1938.

Dej, O.I., Kornijenko, N.P., *Ivan Franko u spohadax sučasnykiv*, L'viv, 1956.

Fechner, Gustav, *Über die Seelenfrage. Ein Gang durch die sichtbare Welt um die unsichtbare zu finden*, Leipzig, 1861.

Gosenpud, A., Ivan Franko. *Stixotvorenija i poemy*, Leningrad, 1960.

[49] M.N. Parxomenko, ..., pp. 211-212 (XI, 546).

Lew, Wasyl, "Učast' Ivana Franka v tvori ukrajins'koji literaturnoji movy," *Zapysky NTSh*, CLXVI, *Zbirnyk filolochičnoji sekciji na pošanu storiččja narodyn Ivana Franka,* New York—Paris—Sydney—Toronto, 1957, pp. 125-132.

Luciv, Luka, *Ivan Franko — borec' za nacional'nu i socijal'nu spravedlyvist',* New York—Jersey City, 1967.

Lužnycky, Hryhor, "Dramatyčnist' poetyčnyx obraziv u tvorax Ivana Franka," CLXXXII. *Zb. Fil. Sek.*, v. 32, New York—Paris—Toronto, 1967, pp. 125-131.

Romanenčuk, Bohdan, "Do problemy svitohljadu Ivana Franka," *ZNTSh,* CLXXXIV. *Zb. Fil. Sek.*, v. 33, New York—Paris—Toronto, 1968, pp. 31-51.

Religious and Moral-Ethical Tenets of Taras Ševčenko

Taras Ševčenko, the greatest Ukrainian poet (1814-1861), is held in high esteem by all Ukrainians not only for his brilliant poetry, exceeding he quality of the poetic works of both predecossors and followers, but also for his role as a revivor of national consciousness of the Ukrainian people. As a result of the Russian oppression and russification of Ukraine for more than 150-years, that consciousness was virtually lifeless at the time Ševčenko was born. He shared the fate of his people, their hardships of serfdom. Out of his forty seven years of life he enjoyed freedom for only thirteen years. In spite of these obstacles he became the greatest among Ukrainians due to his writings, his ideas, and his heroic life as a champion of freedom. He visualized the historic process of his people in relation to their abilities in that process and put for them the ideas of spiritual and national revival as the prerequisite for regaining their state sovereignty.

Ševčenko considered his poetic creativity not as "art for art's sake", but as artistic production in the service of his people and humanity. Due to such a conception, his writings are saturated both with high ideals of a Ukrainian patriot and a sound "message for all humanity, for the suffering and the downtrodden, the victims of injustice and oppression everywhere."[1] Ševčenko wished that the development of moral and

[1] Taras Shevchenko (=Ševčenko), *Selected Poems;* translated with an Introduction by Clarence A. Manning, Jersey City, N.J. 1945, p. I.

national values among the people (learning and knowledge, national consciousness, brotherhood, love for fatherland, unity and work, and so on, might be common to all peoples wishing to develop and secure their spiritual and national growth. The aspiration raises the question: on what foundation did Ševčenko build his ideas and ideals — materialistic or idealistic? More specifically, was Ševčenko a religious person and if so or if not, what were his moral-ethical tenets? This paper is intended to answer this question.

Some scholars believe that Ševčenko was an "unhealthy religious sceptic" (H. Kostel'nyk), others that only the Bible was the source of the formation of his world-view (M. Drahomaniv). The Soviet Marxian scholars label him as materialist and atheist (A. Ričyc'kyj, E.P. Kyryljuk, I. Romančenko and others), and still others consider him a Christian believer (L. Bilec'kyj, Ilarion-metropolitan, V. Ščurat, A. Vlasenko-Bojcun (W. Žyla and others).

The best documental material regarding Ševčenko's relation to the Supernatural Power is found in his poetry and, partly, in his letters. On the basis of that material one can conclude that he was a deep orthodox Christian believer.

In Ševčenko's faith one can discern two main stages: the stage in which his faith was formed under the influence of the religious and ritualistic belief of his environment (home, school, church), and the stage in which that faith broadened and deepened due to his own religious and philosophical meditations. The first stage is marked by Ševčenko's child's and juvenile perception of the Christian legendary plots and lyrical motives as a high-principled struggle and sacrifice for the ideals of truth, presented in the biblical stories, their best protagonist being Jesus Christ. This stage formed the poet's psychological and religious ground in which his ardent desire to seek the truth took root. In the second stage he strenghtened his faith through the activation of his volitional attitude toward the problems of the social, economic, political and national situation of Ukraine under Russian domination. Both stages represent Ševčenko's integral philosophy in his struggle against all forces which have caused the pitiful life conditions of his enslaved people and country.

The atheistic critics in the U.S.S.R. attempt to prevent Ševčenko as an atheist in order to make him fit into their dialectal-materialistic world-view. They ignore numerous passages in the poet's writings reflecting his deep religious convictions and pick up just a few phrases in which he complains and protests against God, and on that basis leap to the conclusion that he was an atheist. They usually refer to the third stanza of his poem "Zapovit" (My Legacy) which reads as follows:

Jak ponese z Ukrajiny	When from Ukraine that stream shall bear
U synjeje more	Over the sea's blue sills
Krov vorožu, — otodi ja	Our foemen's blood, at last shall I
I lany, i hory —	Forsake the fields and hills
Vse pokynu i polynu	(And soar up to commune with God
Do samoho Boha	In His eternal hall.
Molytysja. A do toho	But till that day of Liberty —
Ja ne znaju Boha.	I know no God at all.[2]
Poxovajte ta vstavajte,	Bury me thus — and then arise
Kajdany porvite!	From fetters set you free!

One of the prominent Ukrainian philologists and a specialist in the knowledge of Ševčenko's works, metropolitan Ilarion (formerly known as Ivan Ohijenko, professor at the University of Kyjiv) maintains that the phrase *Ja ne znaju Boha* I know no God) was not in the original text of "Zapovit", that is, in its first addition in Leipzig, 1859. There, he says, on p. 18, one reads:

I lany, i hory — vse pokynu	Forsake the fields and hills
I polynu do samoho Boha	And soar up to commune with God
Molytysja. A dotoho	In His eternal hall.
Poxovajte ta vstavajte,	And before that bury me and then arise,
Kajdany porvite!	From fetters set me free!

The editor of that volume, according to Ilarion, was I. Holovin, a socialist (and atheist, W. J.) Bakuninist, and had there been phrase "I

[2] This translation has been taken from *The Poetical Works of Taras Shevchenko* (=Ševčenko), *The Kobzar*; translated from Ukrainian by Andrusyshen, C.H. and Kirkconnell, Watson; University of Toronto Press, 1964, p. 271. The abbreviation A-n & K-11 will be used for this source. Translations without this information are made by the author of this paper.

know no God", he certainly would not have omitted or changed it. So it appears that later a certain socialist (and atheist, W.J.) inserted that phrase in the poet's "Zapovit" which, resulting in the structural and contextual absurdity of that stanza. First of all it was not necessary to use three lines for one rhyme: *Boha — dotoho — Boha.* This is a poor rhyme suitable for a beginning poet in high school, but not for Ševčenko, a poet of genius. In addition, says Ilarion, the word *dotoho* (originally it was written together) means "perše" (first). With this meaning these lines would read as follows:

Do samoho Boha	To commune with God
Molytysja. A perše	In His eternal hall. But first
Ja ne znaju Boha.	I know no God.

This would mean "I shall pray to God but I know no God." Such nonsense would not be written by Ševčenko. It must be noted that Ševčenko's poems were copied by hand many times over, and it might have happened that a word or even a whole phrase reached the hand of this or that copyist in a distorted form. As a result various versions of the poet's works have been produced.[3] Even if one assumes that the phrase "I know no God" belongs to Ševčenko himself, it does not yet prove that he was an atheist. Academician Stepan Smal'-Stoc'kyj, a specialist in Ševčenko's works, comment that this and certain other of Sevčenko's expressions appealing to God could be "an echo of the *Old Testament* prophets, who certainly were not atheists, their works being included in the *Holy Writ.*"[4] One must also keep in mind that sometimes even religious individuals, when tormented mentally and psychologically, can find themselves on the brink of rebellion against God. Many such examples are found in the *Old Testment.* In the *Psalter,* for example, one finds many of David's complaints against God: Why do bad people have a good life, are rich etc., and why are good people poor and

[3] Mytropolyt Ilarion, *Relihijnist' Tarasa Ševčenka,* Winnipeg: "Volyn'" Publication Committee, 1964, pp. 67-69.

[4] S. Smal'-Stoc'kyj, *Taras Ševčenko, Interpretaciji,* Warsaw: Praci UNI, v. XXV, p. 153.

doomed to live miserable lives; why is the number of enemies growing and so on. The book of *Iova* and the *Bible* contain many additional examples. In like manner Ševčenko, tormented by the reality of the injustice created by evil forces in Ukraine, directed his indignation to God:

Čy, vže Jomu ljubo	Does it make Him happy
Ljudej morduvat'?	To torture the people?
I nadto ubohu	And especially my
Moju Ukrajinu?	Humble Ukraine?
Ščo vona zrobyla?	What wrong has she done?
Za ščo vona hyne?	What is she dying for?

The poet does not negate God, but merely wants Him to replace injustice with justice. God is omnipotent and could do so if He would. But Ševčenko has enough strenght to admit his fault in being rebellious against God in contrast, for example to Adam Mickewicz's Konrad who needs an exorcism performed by the priest Konrad. He submits himself to God by saying: "(God) this is Your will." It must also be noted that sometimes Ševčenko uses the words "Truth","Justice" and others as synonyms for God.

Ševčenko wrote his "Zapovit" (My Legacy) on December 25, 1845; just six days earlier he had written his Psalm 52" in which we read these lines:

Prebezumnyj v serci skaže	Only the fool will to his heart
Ščo Boha nemaje,	Declare there is no God
V bezzakoniji merzije	As he grows foul in lawlessness
Ne tvoryt' blahaja.	And walks in evil shod.
	(tr. A-n & K-ll)

Thus, for Sevčenko God is the unquestionable Truth revealed by everyone who uses his intelligence. A sincere negation of the Supernatural Power can occur only to a person deprived of proper intellectual ability.

When the poet wrote these lines he was thirty one years old, a man with a firmly established religious world-view. Is it likely that he would have changed that view only six days later, saying in his heart "there is

no God"? Certainly not. This stylized expression was Ševčenko's cry arising from the suffering of his captive people in Ukraine and his appeal to God's justice for them. This cry was not a declaration of the poet's religious world-view, but a short temporary outpouring of his feeling motivated by heartbreaking violations of the religious, moral, national and political rights of the Ukrainian people by the Russian tsar Nicholas I and his officials.

Another place in Ševčenko's poetry with which Soviet atheists attempt to support their cynical statement that Ševčenko was atheist is in the poem "Kavkaz" (Caucasus):

Ne nam prju z Toboju staty!
Ne nam dila Tvoji sudyt'!
Nam til'ky plakat', plakat', plakat'
I xlib nasuščnyj zamisyt'
Krovavym potom i sl'ozamy.
Katy znuščajut'sja nad namy,
A pravda nasa pjana spyt'.
Koly vona prokynet'sja? Koly odpočyty
Ljažes, Bože, utomlenyj?
I nam dasy žyty!

'Tis not for us to rise and strive with Thee
Nor judge Thy doings through eternity:
It is our lot to weep, and weep, and weep;
To knead our daily bread; our vigil keep
With agonizing tears and bloody sweat.
Our tourtures abuse us harshly yet
While Justice slumbers in a drunken trance!
When will it rouse, perchance?
When wilt Thou, weary God,
Rest and lay down Thy rod
And grant our spirits peace?
(tr. A-n & K-11)

Here the expression *Koly ljažes, Bože, utomlenyj* (When wilt Thou, weary God, rest), printed in Kyjivan edition, has been deliberately distorted with the intention of labelling Ševčenko an atheist, an absurdity, because God cannot become weary. In the original, Leipzig edition, this passage is quite different:

Koly ž odpočyty	When let you, God,
Dasy, Bože, utomlenym?	Give rest to tired (people)?

As one can see, the attributive adjective utomlenyj belonging to the noun "people" (not expressed yet understood) in the first edition in later editions intentionally transferred to God, so as to attribute to Ševčenko a sarcastic attitude toward God. But this is far from the truth in terms of the poet's faith; because the following lines in the same poem say something different:

My virujem Tvojij syli	We believe in Your power
I Slovu žyvomu;	And Your living Word:
Vstane pravda, vstane volja,	Justice and Liberty will rise,
I Tobi odnomu	And unto Thee
Poklonjat'sja vsi jazyky	All tribes on earth shall bend
Vo viky i viky.	For ages without end.
	(tr. A-n & K-11)

Ševčenko believed that God's help would come to the people struggling for justice and freedom. He inspired the Caucasians to have the same faith in their fight against Russian oppression by saying:

Boritesja — proborete:	Struggle, and ye shall overcome the foe:
Vam Boh pomahaje,	For God shall succour you in battle's throe;
Za vas syla, za vas volja	His strength is on your side, and freedom stand
I pravda svjataja!	With justice on the threshold on your lands!
	(tr. A-n & K-11)

If Ševčenko had not believed in God, he certainly would not have said "For God shall succour you in battle's throe."

The name of God is used by Ševčenko in his works 708 times and the name of Lord (our) God 202 times.[5] Sometimes he uses an appropriate synonym such as Vladyka (Ruler), Vseblahyj (Allblessed), Vsemohutnij (Almighty), Vsevydjašče Oko (All-Seeing Eye), Vsjudysuščyj (Omnipresent), Hospod' (Lord), Hospod' Boh (Lord the God), Nebesnyj Car (Heavenly Tsar), Tvorec', Tvorytel' (Creator), Svjatyj (Holy).[6] The

[5] Anna Vlasenko-Bojcun, *Relihijni motyvy i nazvy v tvorčosti Tarasa Ševčenka,* Miami Beach-Detroit, 1989, p. 6.

[6] Ibidem.

poet saw omnipresent God even "in a little leaf of the smallest plant."[7] By this he understood the Eternal Being (Ens ut sic), but not in the sense of the Spinoza static pantheism or the active pantheism of Leibnitz. Ševčenko's God is not identical with the concrete objects of the nature, but a transcendental Being which can maintain or destroy any existence by means of the absolute act of His will:

Vse od Boha,	All comes from God,
Od Boha vse!	From God is all!
A sam ničoho	And silly man will do nothing (good)
Durnyj ne vdije čolovik!	Without God's help!
"Varnak"	"The Convict"

In his narrative *Mandrivka z pryjemnistju ta j ne bez morali*[8] (A trip with pleasure and not without morality) Ševčenko writes: "Thank you, Almighty God, for giving me the feeling of a man, who loves and sees everything beautiful and crowned in your miraculous everlasting creation." Thus Ševčenko believed in God's creation of the world, that this creation was not made by human hands or by the world itself but by the supernatural and eternal Power.

In "Psalm XII" of *David Psalms* Ševčenko turned to God with these words:

... Bože, pomožy nam	Lord, help us
Vstat' na kata znovu!	Rise against the hangman!

In "Psalm LIII" he said:

Ne zrjat' Boha nad soboju,	They don't know God above themselves,
Ne znajut', ščo dijut'	Don't know what they are doing,
A Boh meni pomahaje,	And God helps me
Mene zastupaje	And God shields me
I jim pravdoju svojeju	And returns their evil
Vertaje jim zlaja.	To them by His truth.

In "Psalm XCIII"

Meni Hospod' prystanyšče	God will be my shelter
Zastupnykom bude.	And my intercessor.

[7] He wrote this in one of letters to Bronislaw Zaleski.

[8] sotnyk = lieutenant of Cossacks

In "Psalm LII":

Kolys' Boh nam verne volju, *Rozibje nevolju.*	Some day God will smash the slavery And will give us freedom back.

In "Psalm LXXXI":

Vstan' že, Bože, sudy zemlju *I sudej lukavyx!*	Rise, o Lord, and judge this earth And these crafty judges'

In his *Diary* under July 14, 1857, Ševčenko wrote:

Myloserdnyj Boh — *moja netlinna nadija*	Merciful God is my imperishable hope

These and many other passages in Ševčenko's works indicate that he believed in God, and that his God was an Eternal Being with the attributes of the Almighty Creator, Just Judge, and the source of the Absolute Truth. By the recognition of these attributes he put himsef in the relationship of a faithful Christian, suborindated to God's will, filled with love for Him, and with hope for His justice and help.

He often turned to God, calling Him *mylyj Bože* (beloved/dear God):

O Bože mij mylyj! *Taka Tvoja volja,* *Take jiji ščstja,* *Taka jiji dolja!* "Pryčynna"	O my dear God! Such is Thy will, Such is her bliss, Such is her fate! "The Bewitched woman"
A zaviščo, Bože mylyj? *Za ščo svitom nudyt'?* "Kateryna"	And what for, dear God? Why does she feel depressed? "Catherine"
O Bože mij mylyj! *Tjažko žyt' na sviti,* *a xočet'sja žyt':* *a xočet'sja dyvytys',* *jak sonečko sjaje,* *Xočet'sja posluxat',* *jak more zahraje,* *Jak ptaška ščebeče,* *bajrak homonyt',*	O my dear God! It's hard to live in this world, Yet I want to live: I want to see the shining sun, I want to hear the dancing of the sea, The chirping of a bird, the gully's talking,

Abo čornobryva
v haju zaspïvaje.
O Bože mij mylyj,
jak veselo žyt'!
"Jarema"

Or a dark-browed girl's
singing in the grove...
O my dear God,
what a joy to live!
"Jarema"

O mylyj Bože Ukrajiny!
Ne daj propasty na čužyni,
V nevol'i vol'nym kozakam!
"Hamalija"

O dear God of Ukraine!
Don't let free Cossacks be lost
In the foreign land as slaves!
"Hamalija"

Bože mylyj!
Zžal'sja Bože mylyj!
"Son"

Dear God!
Have pity, dear God!
"The Dream"

These and numerous other of Ševčenko's intimate appeals to God confirm his deep belief in God and in His omnipotent ability to reveal Himself in the world. This belief and the perception of religiousness as one of the most admirable spiritual values of the individual is found in Ševčenko's narrative *Blyznjata* (The Twins), namely, in his attitude toward the old sotnyk[9] Nyčyhor Fedorovyč Sokyra who distinguished himself by such virtues: "To all the beautiful traits of Sokyra's character one should add the most beautiful one which is religiousness of high quality. Most of all he liked to read the *New Testament.* With all his heart and with all his thoughts he deepily felt the sacred evangelic truth. Every Sunday and Holiday he and his wife attended the Holy Mass at the Cathedral of the Annuciation."[10]

In the lips of the main character of his narrative *Varnak* (The Convict) Ševčenko put the following words: "After my confession and acceptance of the holy Communion I felt better. Religion is a great thing for the individual, especially for such a sinner as I."[11] Subsequently Ševčenko believed that faith in God and religious practice contribute substantially to the individual's spiritual renaissance.

[9] *Povne vydannja tvoriv T. Ševčenka,* v.5, "Blyznjata" (The Twins), Kiev-Leipzig: Ukrajins'ka Nakladnja, p. 137.

[10] *Povne vydannja tvoriv T. Ševčenka,* v. 7, "Varnak", UNI, p. 265.

[11] Ivan Romančenko, *Atejizm T.H. Ševčenka,* Kiev, 1962, p. 25.

Ševčenko believed that God would help him in his sad situation. In "Psalm LII" he says:

Jakby ne Boh pomih meni,	Should my God not help me,
To duša žyvaja	My living soul
Vo t'mi ada potonula,	Would sink in darkness,
Prokljalas' na sviti.	Would be cursed in the world.

Ševčenko believed in God's justice. Here is one example out of numerous:

"...... Ne meni	It's not for me, a common man,
Velykyj Hospody, prostomu,	To judge, Great Lord,
Sudyt' velykyji dila	Great deeds of Your will:
Tvojeji voli: ljuti zla	You don't do hard evil
Ne diješ bez vyny nikomu.	To innocent people.
"Son"	"The Dream"

Ševčenko's faith was firmly connected with his belief in the immortability of human soul:

Jak pered Bohom spovidajus':	I confess as if to God:
Za pravdu na sviti karajus'	I am chastised for the truth,
I ne klenu doli,	And don't curse my fate;
Til'ky Hospoda blahaju:	I just beg the Lord:
Ne daj, Bože, v čužim kraji	Don't let me die, o God,
Zhynut' u nevoli!...	In foreign country as a slave!
	. . . .
Čy ce koly spodijet'sja?	Is there a hope for that?
Čy može vže z neba	Or shall I look at my Ukraine
Podyvljus' na Ukrajinu...	Only from heaven...
"A.O. Kozačkovs'komu"	"To A.O. Kozačkovsky"

In his letter of June 30, 1853 to A. O. Kozačkovsky, a physician in the Seminary of Perejaslav, Ševčenko wrote: "Our friendly sympathy relaxes our sorrows, but the big grief, such as yours now, can be eased only by our common Helper and Knower of hearts. Pray, if you can, and believe in a *better life after death.*"

Ševčenko treated God's word with piety. In his poem "To Osnovjanenko" written in Petersburg, 1839, we read these lines:

Naša duma, naša pisnja
Ne vmre, ne zahyne...
Ot de, ljudy, naša slava,
Slava Ukrajiny!
Bez zolota, bez kamenju,
Bez xytroji movy,
A holosna ta pravdyva,
Jak Hospoda slovo.

Our epic and our ancient song
For ever shall remain,
And that is where our glory lies,
The glory of Ukraine!
Most chaste, with jewels not adorned,
Without embellished speech,
Yet it is deep-toned and precise,
A tongue that God may teach..
(tr. A-n & K-11)

There is no word which would excell the word of God. It is "like refined silver." It is the greatest wisdom and the source of all human wisdom; at the same time it is simple and not exquisite, so that everybody can understand it. Therefore the poet so willingly compares to it the treasure most precious to him — the glory of Ukraine, reflected in its epic and songs.

This word is the Son of God, Savior, Christ. He is the incarnation of the holy Truth, and He brought to the peoples on earth peace and joy through His Gospel. Ševčenko expresses this idea in his poem "Neofity" (Neophites):

Todi vže sxodyla zorja
Nad Vyflejemom; pravdy slovo,
Svjatoji pravdy i ljubovy
Zorja vsevitnjaja zijšla,
I myr i radist' prynesla
Na zemlju ljudjam. Faryseji
I vsja merzenna Judeja
Zavorušylas', zarevla,
Nenače hadyna v boloti,
I Syna Božija vo ploti
Na tij Holhoti rozpjala
Mežy zlodijamy. I spaly,
Upyvšys' kroviju, katy.
A ty vozstav ot hroba!
Slovo vstalo, i Slovo Pravdy
Ponesly po vsij nevol'nyčij zemli
Tvoji apostoly svjatiji.

That was the time when over Bethlehem
A star was rising,
The word of holy Truth and Love
The universal star arose
And brought peace and joy
To the peoples on earth. Pharisees
And all the loathsome Judea
Began to move and hiss
Like snakes in a swamp,
And crucified the incarnate Son of God
On Golgata's hill
Between two thieves. And they, headsmen, were sleeping
Drunken with blood. But Thou were risen from the tomb!
The Word was risen, and Thy apostles
Carried the Word of Truth
All over the captive world.

Ševčenko believed in the deity of Jesus Christ and in His resurrection. He reproached pharisees and loathsome teachers who put themselves above the Incarnate Truth. But the Christians of Ševčenko's contemporaries did not differ very much from them. Many lost that Christian spirit which was characteristic of the neophites of the first Christian era. They believed they were much better than the pharisees of the *Old Testament*, but in reality they were not: the pharisees were vile, they did not accept Christ and crucified Him, but the new Christians of Ševčenko's time accepted Christ as their God, and approved of His teaching and of His principles of life, but only in the theory. In practice they did not live according to this teaching and principles, offending and crucifying Him by their sins. In "Neophites" Ševčenko says with indignation:

Ne znaju, *Dlja čoho, spravdi, my čytajem* *Svjatuju zapovid' joho,* *Česnuju krov Joho pjemo,* *Mov u šynkarky medu čarku...* *O sujeslovy! Na žydax?...* *Ne na žydax, — na nas lukavyx* *Na ditjax našyx prepohanyx* *Svjataja krov Joho!... Katy!* *Sobaky bez očej skaženi,* *Vy i bačyte! Zemni* *Bjete poklony, za xresty* *Xovajetes' od satany* *I prosyte styxa* *Supostatam xrystyjanam* *To čumy, to lyxa,* *To vsjakoho bezholovja —* *A vse po zakonu...* *A bodaj vas!* *Ta cur že vam,* *Novym faraonam* *I kesarjam ljudojidam!*	I cannot know Why we, in truth, upon this world below, Shoud read His holy edicts and should drink His sacred blood and of it no more think Than of a glass of mead in a tavern revel... O hypocrits, ye children of the Devil, Not for the Jews but for us reprobates And for our wicked children there awaits The judgment of that Blood! Ye sons of night, Insensate dogs, deprived in truth of sight, You cannot see at all! Flat on the ground Your greasy, praying carcasses are found; Behind a cross from devils you would hide,

And then beneath your breath a
prayer of pride
Asks God to send the worst
adversity
And every kind of plague in high
degree
Upon your fellow-Christians, dee
med your foes —
May God appoint your condign
overthrows,
All you new pharaohs with your
hearts of clay,
Repacious Caesars of this later
day!
(tr. A-n & K-11)

These Christians made the sign of cross ("Behind a cross from devils you would hide"), humiliated themselves for the sake of their personal worthless goals ("Flat on the ground your greasy, praying carcasses re found"), but they have no understanding of their neighbors' needs. To Christ, said Ševčenko, all people were His brothers and sisters, even those who crucified Him, and He wished well to all of them. Many Christians of the poet's time asked God "to send the worst adversity and every kind of plague in high degree" upon their fellow-Christians, deemed their foes. In practice they had no Christian love for their neighbors. Instead of love, their heart was filled with hatred in various forms. Ševčenko felt sorry for them but at the same time blamed them and felt angry at them.

The Soviet atheist Ivan Romančenko (and some other propagandists of dialectial materialism) tries to cast doubt on Sevčenko's faith in Christ by picking up on the following passage from the poet's "Caucasus": "Za koho Ty rozipjavsja, Chryste, synu Božyj? Za nas dobryx,čy za slovo istyny... Čy može, ščob my z Tebe nasmijalys'? Vono tak i stalos'." (For whom were you crucified, Christ, Son of God? For us, good people, or for the word of truth...Or, perhaps, to let us laugh at You? That indeed has happened). Romančenko says: "As we see, Ševčenko leads readers to clearly negative conclusions, attempts to convince them not to believe in any god, to believe only in their own mind

and power, and in the truth that one can get rid of social injustice only by using his own power, and not with the assistance of a god and his servants."[12]

Romančenko deliberately darkens Ševčenko's thought. The reader may get the impression that Ševčenko had no deep understanding of the sense of Christ's sufferings leading to His death. Ševčenko knew that Christ had died for all the peope, good and bad, so that good people would become even better, while evil people would enter onto the road of righteousness, gradually would be growing better too. But that had not happened. The people were not better then than they had been before Christ's death. Those armed with evil were powerful, enslaving the powerless (Ševčenko had in mind tsarist Russia and the enslaved Ukraine). Confronting such a sad picture, Ševčenko could be bothered by the question as to whether it had been justified for Christ to accept tortures and ignominious death on the cross to make people better. Such question might have arisen under the pressure of temporary emotions, but it was not grounded deeply in the soul and did not reflect his disbelief in Christ. This was not atheism but a recognition of Christ's teaching about ideals which, when materialized by the individuals and the people at large, would make them and the whole world better. Unfortunately, the materialization of these ideals had not taken place. Ševčenko's voice of despair was tinged with irony.

Ševčenko's ironic expression, quoted by Romančenko, could also have reflected his criticism of Byzantine caesarian papistry, accepted and practiced by Moscow after the fall of Constantinople in 1453, and the subsequent total subordination of the Russian Orthodox Church to the tsar and his bureacracy. As a result, the intimidated Russian clergy became an instrument of political imperialism of the tsar and his officials, and of their national chauvinism with regard to the Ukrainian nation. This, of course, did not correspond to Christ's teaching, for which He died.

Ševčenko was not a saintly person. He was not perfect, but had his shortcomings as most religious people have in their life, and like many

[12] *Taras Ševčenko,* v. X, Chicago: The Denysjuk Publisher, p. 48.

believers he sometimes, though seldom, was on the brink of losing confidence in what he strongly believed. Soon, however, through meditation he regained spiritual balance and with it his previous firm belief. For example, in his letter to princess Barbara Repnin in March of 1850 he wrote from Orenburg: "I read the *New Testament* with reverential trepidation," and in his previous letter to her dated February 28, 1848 he wrote: "If you have the first or the second edition of the book by Thomas Kempis about the *Imitation of Christ* in Speransky's translation, please send it to me for God's sake."[13]

Ševčenko mentioned Jesus Christ many times in his poems and letters with supreme reverence, using for Him various synonymic names such as Serceznavec' (The Reader of the human heart), Čolovikoljubec' (The Lover of mankind), Mesija (Messiah), Syn Božyj (The Son of God), Syn Mariji (The Son of Mary) and others.

In his *Ukrainian Primer*[14] besides the prayers "Our Father" and "I believe in One God" there is also the following text: Jesus Christ, Son of God, taught the lawless people the word of truth and love, the only sacred law. The lawless people gave no credit to His word, a sincere holy word, and crucified Him between the bandits as a rebel and blasphemer. The apostles, His holy disciples, carried His word of truth and love and sacred prayer all over the world." If Ševčenko had not believed in Christ he certainly would not have included this passage in his *Primer*

Ševčenko had devotion to the Blessed Virgin Mary. He called her "Blessed among women," "Immaculate," The Queen of heaven and earth," "Joy for the sorrowful," and others. His sincere devotion is expressed in his poem "Maria" (Mary):

Vse uponvanije moje	O my resplendent Paradise, I place
Na Tebe mij presvitlyj raju,	My hope in you and in your tender grace, —
Na myloserdije Tvoje;	And rest in you my yearnings and my plaints,
Vse uponanije moje	O holy Sustenance of all the saints,
Na Tebe, Maty, vozlahaju,	
Svjataja sylo vsix svjatyx,	
Preneporočnaja, blahaja!	

[13] under the title *Bukvar južnorusskij,* S. Petersburg, 1861, p. 8.
[14] Ibidem.

Moljusja, plaču i rydaju:
Vozzry, Prečystaja, na jix,
Otyx okradenyx, slipyx
Nevol'nykiv; podaj jim sylu
Tvojoho mučenyka Syna,
Ščob xrest-kajdany donesly
Do samoho, samoho kraju!
Dostojno-pitaja! Blahaja,
Caryce neba i zemli!

Mother most blessed, most im-
maculate!
I pray, I weep, I cry in sorry
state:
Look down, Most Pure One, on
these blinded slaves
Benighted and despoiled by evil
knaves;
Vouchsafe to them your martyred
Son's own strength
To bear their crosses and their
chains at length
To the extremity of pain and
death!
O worthily extolled by my poor
breath
As Queen of heaven and earth!
(tr. A-n & K-11)

Ševčenko's desire to recreate the feelings of a virgin-mother was the embryonic motive of the creative power of his mind which, in seeking the artistic form of its selfrevelation, was embodied in the description of the conception of Immaculate Virgin Mary, ascribing to it anthropomorphic features. Nevertheless, this does not negate his belief in her Immaculate Conception, as seems evident from the fact that in the prayer included in the above mentioned *Primer* (which was compiled at about the same time as the poem was written) one reads: "Jesus Christ, Son of God, *incarnated by the Holy Spirit and born from Blessed Mary...*"[15]

The intercession of Blessed Virgin Mary with God and her help to believers was integral part of Ševčenko's faith. She helped the Zaporozian Cossacks return to Ukraine: God's Mother looked at the aggrieved and, together with them,

[15] Mytropolyt Ilarion, op. cit., p. 15.

Zaplakala sl'ozamy svjatymy,	Began to weep mercifully,
Zaplakala myloserda,	As for her Son,
Nenače za Synom,	And God took pity
A Boh zhljanuvs' na ti sl'ozy	On those tears
I na Ukrajinu...	And on Ukraine...
"Iržavec"'	"Iržavec"'

In his poem "Po ulyci viter vije" (The wind is blowing on the Street) Ševčenko depicts a touching plot: The widow's son is drafted into the army. Before that she had hoped that in her old age she would live peacefully with him and her daughter-in-law for the rest of her life, but her dream has not come true. She remains alone and lonesome. And

Ona vyblahala	She obtained by begging
Tuju kopijčyny...	That poor penny
Ta Prečystij postavyla	And offered a small candle
Svičečku za syna.	To the Immaculate for her son.

Only a deeply religious poet could sympathetically depict a mother who offered her last penny to Blessed Virgin hoping that the latter would help her son take good care of himself.

Ševčenko believed in prayer. It was an integral part of his Christian philosophy and his life. In summer of 1859 he was temporarily in Kyjiv and lived in the suburb of Priorka at Mrs. Kropyvyn's. Her daughter has left her the diary of that time in which she writes Ševčenko used to get up early in the morning, at four o' clock, wash himself with cold water and then pray.[16] In his poem "Čyhyryn" he said:

Pomolyvšys' i ja b zasnuv,	After praying I would fall asleep
Tak dumy prokljati	But drafter thoughts of art
Prut'sja dušu zapalyty	Are striving to inflame my soul
Serce rozirvaty...	And break my heart apart.
	(tr. A-n & K-11)

In his letter to princess Barbara Repnin on February 28, 1848, he writes: "Before the ringing of the church bells for the matins I recalled the words of Christ who was crucified for us and I was feeling as though

[16] Same note as under Footnote 13.

revived: I went to the matins and prayed joyfully and purely as never before. Now I am fasting and today I received holy Communion. I wish my whole life could be as pure and beautiful as this one today."[17] This passage, the passage in Priorka's diary, and that in the poem "Čyhyryn" suggest that Ševčenko prayed every day in the morning and at night before going to bed. It must have been his daily practice, which proving beyond any doubt that Ševčenko was not atheist.

There are many places in Ševčenko's writings which prove that he considered prayer to be beneficial for the individual and the people. In his poem "Mary" he relies upon help of Blessed Virgin Mary and he finds hope for a successful result of his prayer. His belief in the strength of prayer is also expressed in the poem "Čy my zijdemosja znovu" (Shall we ever meet again):

Smyritesja, molites' Bohu	Humble yourself, pray to God,
I zhadujte odyn druhoho,	And remember one another,
Svoju Ukrajinu ljubit',	Love your country, your Ukraine,
Ljubit' jiji... Vo vremja ljute,	Love her love... in arduous time
V ostannju tjažkuju minutu	At the supreme moment
Za neji Hospoda molit'!	Pray to God for her!

Ševčenko's love for neighbors and prayer for their good was combined into an integral unity. In his letter to princess Barbara Repnin, dated Feb. 29, 1848, he writes: Pray, pray, your prayer pleases God. It will protect me from that terrible coldness which begins to enter my weakened soul." In another letter to her on March 7, 1850, he said: "I pray to God and hope my ordeal some day will end." In his poem "Oj hljanu ja, podyvljusja" (O, I cast my look) we read:

Pišov by ja v Ukrajinu,	I wish I could go to Ukraine,
Pišov by dodomu,	I wish I could go home,
Tam by mene pryvitaly,	There I would be welcome,
Zradily b staromu,	They would rejoice at old man,
Tam by ja spočyv xoč malo,	There at least I would rest a little
Molyvšysja Bohu.	While praying to God.

[17] S. Smal'-Stoc'kyj, *Ideji Ševčenkovoji tvorčosty*, Lviv, 1914, p. 2.

The poet would pray not only after his release from banishment and his return to Ukraine, but also during his stay in exile, hoping that God would help free him:

A ja dolen'ko v nevoli	And I, my fate, though enslaved
Pomoljusja Bohu.	Will be with God in my pray.

The national, social, and political liberation of the Ukrainian people was primary goal in Ševčenko's ife and the main motivation of his creativity. He believed that all Ukrainians would express their thanks to God upon liberation.

Cerkva-domovyna	The church beneath the skies
Rozvalyt'sja, a z-pid neji	Will crumble down, but from its vaults
Vstane Ukrajina	A new Ukraine will rise
I rozvije t'mu nevoli,	To end the night of slavery;
Svit pravdy zasvityt',	Injustice will be gone,
I pomoljat'sja na voli	Our serf-born sons' will pray
Nevol'nyči dity.	And great sweet Freedom's dawn!
"Subotiv"	"Subotiv" (tr. A-n & K-11)

Besides cherishing his religious feelings Ševčenko based his thoughts and deeds on the principles of Christian morality and ethics. He put love of neighbors into a fundamental code of relationship among the people. In "Psalm LIII" he says:

Pomoljusja Hospodevi	From my lonely heart to God
Sercem odynokym	A thankful prayer shall rise,
I na zlyx mojix pohljanu	And on the wicked I shall glance
Ne zlym mojim okom.	With not unkindly eye.

His love of neighbor based on Christ's teaching tells him to foster the ideal of forgiveness of his enemies. His ideal of forgiveness was rooted in his belief that sooner or later the Truth would conquer the untruth, the Good will subdue the Evil. He believed in "the new voice of the holy Truth," meaning by "Truth" a universal humane relationship based on the Christian conception of the world and mankind. This is evident from the picture drawn by him in his poem "Neophites":

O Nerone,
Nerone ljutyj! Božyj sud
Pravdyvyj, nahlyj sered šljaxu
Tebe osudyt'...Pryplyvut'
I pryletjat' zo vsjoho svita
Svjatiji mučenky-dity
Svjatoji voli; kruh odra,
Kruh smertnoho tvoho prestanut'
V kajdanax i,... tebe prostjat':
Vony — braty i xrystyjany,
A ty — sobaka, ljudujid,
Despot skaženyj!...

O ruthless Nero! From those
darkened regions
God's sudden, righteous judge
ment will surprise you
And on the open highway agon-
ize you...
From every clime they'll answer
to the call,
The holy martyrs, children, one
and all,
Of sacred liberty. They'll sail,
they'll fly,
And round your dirty deathbed
as you die
They will appear in chains and...
will forgive you:
For they are Christian brothers
who outlive you,
While you're a vicious cur, a rav-
ening beast,
A raving despot at the human
feast!
(tr. A-n & K-11)

Ševčenko did not accept the idea of "eye for eye, tooth for tooth," but at the same time he did not compromise with evil, as S. Smal'-Stockyj correctly put it:" He knows only one ethical law of the veracious religion which he applies to all human deeds, the law of unbounded love."[18] Unfortunately, Ševčenko did not see that kind of love among the people:

Mij Bože mylyj! Jak to malo
Svjatyx ljudej na sviti stalo!
Odyn na odnoho kujut'
Kajdany v serci, a slovamy,

Dear Lord! How few the righteous are
That in the world remain!
Each heart would for its brother forge
Captivity's dark chain;

[18] H. Lužnyc'kyj, "Istota terpinnja v Ševčenkovyx tvorax", *Kyjiv*, berezen'-kviten' 1958.

Medotočyvymy ustamy *Cilujut'sja, i času ždut',* *Čy švydko brata v domovyni* *Z hostej na cvyntar povezut'.* "Podrazanije XI Psalmu"	With honeyed phrases on their lips, Each seeks to kiss the other; And yet he grimly waits a time For burying his brother. "Imitation of Psalm XI" (tr. A-n & K-11)

In another poem one reads:

U vsjakoho svoja dolja *I svij šljax šyrokyj:* *Toj muruje, toj rujnuje,* *Toj nesytym okom* *Za kraj s'vita zazyraje* *Čy nema krajiny* *Ščob zaharbat' i z soboju* *Vzjat' u domovynu;* *Toj tuzamy obyraje* *Svata v joho xati,* *A toj nyškom u kutočku* *Hostryt' niž na brata.* "Son"	Each person has his destiny, His road beneath the sky: One builds with care, and one destroys, And one with greedy eye Peers past the limits of the world For more land to enslave And seize and take along with him Into his very grave; One man with aces robs his friend And pities not the clown; One whets his knife in secrecy To strike his brother down. "The Dream" (tr. A-n & K-11)

Instead of love and brotherhood Ševčenko saw hatred, instead of sincerity — hypocrisy, instead of constructive work — destruction, in short, all vices violating Christian morality and ethics. In view of these negative traits of his Christian brothers he appealed to them:

Umyjtesja! Obraz Božyj *Bahnom ne skvernite!* *Sxamenit'sja, Bud'te ljudy!* "Poslanije"	Make yourselves clean! God's image clear In man should not be sullied here! Come to your senses! Human be! "My Friendly Epistle" (tr. A-n & K-11)

Here Ševčenko had in mind those landlords and elite who were not sympathetic to the needs of their poor countrymen, the peasants, and did not try to improve their miserable living conditions. With noble indignation he goes on to say in the above poem:

Ne durite ditej vašyx *Ščo vony na sviti* *Na te til'ky, ščob panuvat'—*	Don't breed your children up in scorn To think that they were proudly born To lord it over humble folk —

The lack of Christian love is accompanied by a lack of deep understanding of the sense of suffering caused by that love. "Only love can be the source of a higher level fo suffering."[19] Such a higher level of suffering is the core of Christian suffering and is motivated by a higher degree of Christian love. Thus Ševčenko's characters possessing a higher degree of Christian love possess more spiritual strength, for example, Hanna in the poem "The Hired Woman", than those whose such love is weak, e.g. Catherine in the poem "Kateryna." Hanna's natural motherly love was strengthened by her awareness of her relationship to God's commandment about love for one's neighbors and to the commandment "Do not kill", and the subsequently acquires strength which helps her avoid committing suicide ("No, fog of mind, go away, don't press me to put an end to my life! Just hide me in the field"). Instead she enters upon the road of suffering accompanied by her prayer and belief in its success ("I shall pray, and by weeping I'll get better fate for you from heaven"). Catherine's Christian love is weak. After she tresspasses God's law, she breaks her connection with God. Without His help she cannot rise and get spritual strength. Being pressed by "shameful fate" she takes the path of least resistance, not opposing the irrational force of her disturbed mind. In a fit of nerves she commits suicide. Such an epilogue of the path of life designed by Ševčenko for the heroine of his poem "Catherine" is the result of her tresspassing the moral law, caused by not strengthening her natural motherly love with deep Christian love, allowing her to break her connection with God and His commanment "Do not kill".

However, in general, the poet treats representatives of the peasantry favorably because he recognizes their virtues, such as the piety morality and ethics. On the other hand he remonstrated sharply against those "enlightened Christians," the elite and oppressive Ukrainian landlords, who had fallen under the influence of "the foreign wisdom."

[19] Here Ševčenko alludes to German philosophy, possibly to one of its representatives — Johann Gottlieb Fichte (1762-1814), who theorized that reality exists only in our senses.

Ševčenko calls them ironically "know-alls" and "sages." They did not serve their people as they should have because their knowledge was not suited to the needs of the enslaved people; they wandered in the realm of abstract phraseology and useless theoretical discussions. Ševčenko reproaches them in the following verse:

I my — ne my, i ja — ne ja,	We are not we, and I not I,
I vse te bačyv, vse te znaju:	I've seen all that; I'm now all-wise;
Nemaje pekla, ani raju,	There is no hell, no paradise,
Nemaje Boha, til'ky ja,	Not even God; but I exist
Ta kucyj nimec' uzlovatyj	And this smart German atheist
A bil'š ničoho...	And nothing else...
"Poslanije"	"My friendly Epistle" (tr. A-n & K-11)

These "enlightened Christians" (the elite and landlords) were ignorant in the realm of broad and solid knowledge and were cynical with regard to morality and ethics. They had some foreign knowledge, but no innate wisdom or will to select and adopt only those elements of that knowledge which would serve the spiritual and national purposes of the Ukrainian people in perspective of their liberation.

Ševčenko blames the above "enlightened Christians" for their profligacy, drunennis, immorality and other vices:

Oce ledaščo — ščyryj pan	There's the sluggard — canded lord;
Pje horilku z mužykamy	Drinks down whiskey with moujiks
I vol'nodumstvuje v šynku.	And talks liberal in a towern.

Ta šče v seli svojim divčatok	In his village picks young girls
Perebyraje; ta sprosta	And every year holds for baptizing
Taky svojix bajstrjat z desjatok	About ten of his bastard babies
U hod poderžyt' do xresta,	And that's all...
Taj til'ky ž to...Kruhom paskuda!	A thorough rotter!
"P.S."	"P.S."

Ševčenko expresses his indignation at the fact that people did not call such landlord a "rotter," that is, the name which would properly define its morality:

Čomu ž joho tak ne zovut?	Why don't they call him so?
Čomu na njoho ne pljujut?	Why don't they spit on him?
Čomu ne topčut? Ljudy, Ljudy!	Why don't they tread on him?

Za šmat hnyloji kovbasy	People, people! If you're asked
U vas xoč matir poprosy —	To sell your mother for a piece
To oddaste...	Of rotten sausage, you would do it.
"P.S."	"P.S."

It is generally assumed that the word "mother" includes the greatest value in the life of every son and daughter. It exceeds all the material goods regardless of their content and form. Only a degenerate son or daughter could value goods more than their own mother. Although Ševčenko did not give a concrete example of such a low grade of morals among Ukrainians, he wanted them to be reasonable and objective in properly evaluating the qualititative levels of various goods, deeds, events and actions. He did not defame all Ukrainians for such vices. On the contrary, they were basically good, their life was filled with values of the idealistic world-view, characteristic of their very nature. Deviations in this aspect occured almost exclusively among landlords and the intelligentsia under the influence of foreign philisophical and social trends.

Ševčenko ascribed great significance to the parental influence on their children. Scandals of any kind, direct or indirect, should never take place in such a relationship:

Naščo vony ditjam?	What's the use of them to children?
Na naruhu pered Bohom?	Just for outrage before God!
Dobre otym	It is good
Syrotam ščaslyvym,	For those orphans
Ščo ne majut' otyx bat'kiv,	Who don't have such parents:
To j ne sohrišajut'.	Thus they don't trespass against God.
"Sotnyk"	"Cossack Lieutenant"

Recognizing the belief in God, morality and ethics as a sound foundation of the general good, and basing on it his ideas for a national Ukrainian revival, Ševčenko was aware of his role. He felt that he was called by God to stand up for the cause of his people, to fight for their justice and to serve them with his poetic talent. Nevertheless, the awareness of his spiritual and national superiority did not draw a boundary between him and his people. Like biblical Moses, he remained always with his people in thought and heart. He felt that he was of his people and for his people, that he was their spiritual leader and servant at the

same time. Such an understanding of his role enriched his spirituality with the virtue of Christian modesty. Like the biblical publician he called himself a sinful man. Here is what he said in this regard in his poem "Čy to nedolja ta nevolja" (Is it My Grief and My Captivity):

Čy ja, žyvučy
Z ljud'my v paskudi, opaskudyv
I dušu čystuju?... A ljudy
(Zvyčajne, ljudy), smijučys',
Zovut' jiji i molodoju,
I neporočnoju, svjatoju,
I šče jakojus'... Vorohy!
I ljuti, ljuti! Vy ž ukraly,
V bahno pohane zaxovaly
Almaz mij čystyj, dorohyj,
Moju kolys' svjatuju dušu,
Ta j smijetes'! Nexrystyjany!
Čy ne miž vamy ž ja, pohani
Tak opohanyvs' ščo j ne znat'.
Čy j buv ja čystym kolynebud'?!
Bo vy mene z svjatoho neba
Vzjaly miž sebe, i pysat'
Pohani virši naučyly!
Vy tjažkyj kamin' položyly
Posered šljaxu i rozbyly
O joho, Boha bojo bojačys',
Moje maleje, ta ubohe,
Te serce pravedne kolys'.
Teper idu ja bez dorohy,
Bez šljaxu bytoho... A vy
Dyvujetes', ščo spotykajus',
Ščo vas i dolju prokylanju,
I plaču tjažko, i jak vy,
Duši ubohoji curajus'
Svojeji hrišnoji duši!...

Have I by living with villains
Befouled my spotless soul?...
And the people (sure, the people),
They laugh and call it young and pure
And holy, sacred and so on.
O foes! Ferocious foes!
It's you who stole and hid
In dirt my diamond, pure and dear,
My former sinless soul;
And you are laughing!
You are no Christians!
Isn't it true, o you disgusting,
That by living among you
I fouled myself so much
That I don't even know
Whether I've ever been pure?
Because you've taken me from welkin
To live with you and you've taught me
To write paltry poems!
You put a heavy stone
In the middle of the road
And fearing of God you broke my heart,
My teeny and squalid, once righteous heart.
Now I'm going without a road,
Without a beaten track... And you are
Wondering that I've been stumbling
And cursing; my fate and You...
I shed my heavy tears
And like you am ashamed of my poor soul,
My sinful soul!...

The poet was aware of his human weaknesses. Once his soul was pure, but the sinful world had debased it. Disliking his soul in such a state, he desired to purify it with a view to better serving his people and humanity.

The analysis of Taras Ševčenko's poetry and prose in regard to its

religious, moral and ethical motives in them proves that he believed in the Supernatural Power with all the attributes of Its divine nature. He believed in Jesus Christ and in His divine mission, and in the Blessed Virgin Mary who gave birth to Jesus Christ, and in Her intercession with Christ for the needy. Along with this he recognized and practiced moral and ethical principles based on Christian faith. He never distorted reality nor let immoral forces corrupt his mind and soul. He was a great patriot. His patriotism was not accompanied by hatred for his personal or his people's foes, but by an infinite love for his people, his country and humanity. His love for his nation was fused with his love for God. These two streams of love were reflected in his inclination to forgive his enemies their crimes once the people's struggle for spiritual, social, national and political justice materialized.

BIBLIOGRAPHY CONSULTED

1. Bilec'kyj Leonid, *Virujučyj Ševčenko,* Winnipeg: UVAN, 1949.
2. "Taras Ševčenko i joho istoriosofija," Černivci: *Samostijna dumka,* kn. 4, 1934.
3. Bojko-Bloxyn Jurij, *Ševčenko i Moskva, Vybrane,* t. III, München, 1981; reprint in the journal *Vyzvol'nyj šljax,* kn. 3,4,5,6,7,8, 1989.
4. Bojcun-Vlasenko Anna, *Relihijni motyvy i nazvy v tvorčosti Tarasa Ševčenka,* Miami Beach-Detroit, 1989; 109 pp.
5. Čyževs'kyj Dmytro, *A History of Ukrainian Literature,* Littleton, Colo,: Ukrainian Academic Press, 1975; pp. 498-526.
6. Dorošenko Volodymyr, *Ševčenkova krynycja,* Lviv, 1922.
7. Franko Ivan, "Ševčenkova Maria", *Zapysky NTŠ,* t. CXIX-CXX, 1917.
8. Ilarion Mytropolyt (=Ivan Ohijenko), *Relihijnist' Tarasa Ševčenka,* Winnipeg: "Volynijana" X, 1964; 102 pp.
9. Kyryljuk E.P., *Taras H. Ševčenko. Žyttja i tvorčist',* Kyjiv; Deržavne vyd-vo xudožnjoji literatury, 1959; 676 pp.
10. Kolessa Ol., "Ševčenko i Mickjevič", *Zapysky NTŠ,* t. III.
11. Kostel'nyk Havryjil, *Ševčenko z relihijo-etyčnoho stanovyšča,* Lviv, 1910.
12. Luciv Luka, *Taras Ševčenko — spivec' ukrajins'koji slavy i voli,* New York; "Naukove Tovarystvo im. Ševčenka i Svoboda," 1964; 187 pp.
13. Nazarenko Ivan Dm., *Suspil'no-polityčni, filosofs'ki, estetyčni ta atejisyčni pohljady T.H. Ševčenka,* vyd. 2 dopovnene, Kyjiv: vyd-vo xudožnjoji literatury, 1964; 398 pp.

14. Odarčenko Petro, *Svitova slava Ševčenka* (T.H. Ševčenko v svitli svitovoji krytyky), Čikago: Ukrajins'kyj Publicystyčno-Naukovyj Instytut, 1964; 55 pp.
15. Ričyc'kyj Andrij, *Taras Ševčenko v svete epoxi: kritičeskij očerk,* Moskva: Gosudarstvennoe izd-vo xudožestvennoj literatury, 172 pp.
16. Romančenko Ivan, *Atejizm T. H. Ševčenka,* Deržavne vyd-vo xudožnjoji literatury, 1962; 100 pp.
17. Slavins'kyj M. "Ševčenko i Biblija", *Ukrainskaja žyzn',* No.2, Moskva, 1912.
18. Smal-Stoc'kyj Stepan, *Taras Ševčenko. Interpretaciji,* Waršava: Praci UNI, t. XXV, serija literaturno-istoryčna, No. 1, 1934: 237 pp.
19. Šabljovs'kyj Evhen St., *Humanizm Ševčenka i naša sučasnist',* Kyjiv: Naukova dumka, 1964; 376 pp.
20. ——————, *Narod i slovo Ševčenka,* Kyjiv: vyd-vo ANRSR, 1961; 533 pp.
21. *Shevchenko and the Critics, 1861-1980,* edited by George S. N. Luckyj; translated by Dolly Ferguson and Sophia Yurkevich; introduction by Bohdan Rubčak; Toronto-Buffalo: University of Toronto Press in association with the Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies, 1980; 522 pp.
22. *Taras Ševčenko, the Poet of Ukraine;* selected poems translated and with an introduction by Clarence A. Manning, Jersey City, N.J.: Ukrainian National Association, 1945; 217 pp.
23. *Taras Ševčenko 1814-1861. A Symposium,* edited by Volodymyr Mijakovs'kyj and Y. Shevelov on behalf of the Ukrainian Academy of Arts and Sciences in the United States, Gravenhage. The Hague: Mouton & Co., 1962; 203 pp.
24. *Taras Ševčenko, 1814-1861, The Kobzar of Ukraine;* translated by Alexander Jardine Hunter, 2nd print., edited by J.B. Rudnyc'kyj, New York: "Hoverla", 1961; 144 pp.; Ukrainian Free Academy of Sciences, Institute of Ševčenkology, No. 4; 142 pp.
25. *Taras Ševčenko, 1814-1861, Poems:* selections, English and Ukrainian, Dnipro Publishers, 1977; 322 pp.
26. Taras Ševčenko, *Povne vydannja tvoriv Tarasa Ševčenka,* Čikago: Vyd-vo Mykoly Denysjuka, v. I, 1959, XVI Ń 352 pp.; v. II, 1961, 314 pp.; v. III, 1959, 398 pp.; v. IV, 1962, 400 pp.; v.V, 1959, 304 pp.; v.VI, 1959, 339 pp.; v.VII, 1959, 328 pp.; v. VIII, 1960, 385 pp.; v. IX, 1960, 364 pp.; v.X, 1960, 404 pp.; v. XI, 1963, 362 pp. Ń 62 pages of Ševčenko's pictorial reproductions; v. XII, 1963, 456 pp.; v. XIII, 1963, 304 pp.; v. XIV, 1964, 506 pp.
27. *Taras Ševčenko, Kobzar;* z pojasnennjamy i prymitkamy Vasylja Simovyča, 3-e vyd. Winnipeg: Komitet ukrajinciv Kanady, 1971; XXXIII+431 pp.
28. Taras Ševčenko, *Kobzar*, 2-e popravlene j dopovnene vydannja, Winnipeg:

Ukrajins'ka Vil'na Akademija Nauk v Kanadi, naklad Vydavnyčoji Spilky "Tryzub"; v. I-II, 1952, 468 pp., v. III, 1953, 576 pp., v. IV, 1954, 556 pp., Redakcija, statti i pojasnennja Leonida Bilec'koho.

29. Ščurat Vasyl', *Svjate pys'mo v Ševčenkovij poeziji,* Lviv: vyd. Myxajlo Terlec'kyj, 1904; 67 pp.
30. Vlasovs'kyj I., *Obraz Tarasa Ševčenka v svitli relihijnoji dumky*, New York-Bound Brook, 1961; 32 pp.
31. Zajcev Pavlo, *Žyttja Tarasa Ševčenka,* New York-Paryž-München: Naukove Tovarystvo im. Ševčenka, 1955; 400 pp.
32. Žyla Volodymyr, "Davydovi Psalmy — relihijna liryka Ševčenka," *Vyzvol'nyj šljax,* XLII, No. 4, 1989, pp. 421-431.

Ševčenko's Main Postulates in Reviving and Developing the Ukrainian Nation

In the history of some nations there were periods of national and political weakness, producing no great political leaders able to revive, strengthen and materialize the national and political aspirations of their nation through liberation from the oppression of its occupants. In such periods sometimes great bards appear whose inspired words not only fill the gap of the lack of political leadership, but even surpass them in their contribution to the cause of national liberation. Such was the case in Scotland, which got its national bard Burns in the second half of the 18th century. Such also was the case with the Polish people who received their inspiration from Adam Mickiewicz in their struggle for regaining political independence from Russia in the 19th century, and there were other cases in the history of other nations. A similar situation occured in the history of the Ukrainian people in the 19th century when they were given Taras Ševčenko, a poet of genius and, at the same time, a champion of freedom and liberty, a prophet and a national leader.[1]

[1] Main sources utilized in this paper are: Taras Ševčenko, *Kobzar,* Povne vydannja v tr'ox tomax, "Ukrajins'ka Biblioteka", 1947; *Kobzar,* Introduction and Commentary by Dr. Wasyl' Simovyč, Winnipeg: Ukrainian Canadian Committee, 1971.

At that time the national conscience of the Ukrainian people, especially in Eastern Ukraine, was becoming extinguished under a long period of national, cultural and political oppression by the Russian regime. Primordial hostile forces were carving deeper and deeper the brand of slave on the psyches of Ukrainians. The notion of "the Ukrainian nation" remained an empty phrase, Ukraine in reality comprising an enormous ethnic group unaware of its proper history, its culture, language, folklore and so on, and unable to manifest these values not only as a separate ethnic population above all as a national and political state in Eastern Europe.

There was no political elite nor political leaders whose minds and hearts were filled with understanding that in the existing conditions only the nation's own independent state could provide its citizens freedom, justice and power. Fortunately, in that period of total inertia of Ukrainians toward the cause of their liberation, the Divine Providence sent them Taras Ševčenko, a poet of genius and national bard who, with his flaming word, proclaimed his postulates and ideals for the rebirth of his countrymen and for the growth of their national-political thought and aspirations which later led to the proclamation of the sovereignty, independence and unification of Ukraine in 1918-1919.

The most significant of those postulates was the *awakening of the Ukrainian people's consciousness of their national identity and dignity,* expressed in his poems by creating contrasting pictures:

Bulo kolys' na Vkrajini—	It used to be in my Ukraine —
Revily harmaty;	Self-propelled guns were roaring;
Bulo kolys' — zaporožci	It used to be — the Dnipro Cossacks
Vmily panuvaty!	Knew how to rule, command!
Panuvaly, dobuvaly	They ruled, commanded and procured
I slavu, i volju...	Renown, and fame and freedom...
Mynulosja, ostalysja	But all that passed, and only graves
Mohyly po polju...	As witness have remained...
"Ivan Pidkova"	"Ivan Pidkova"

The former glory and power of Ukraine is contrasted against her humilitation and weakness in Ševčenko's time, the possibilites against

the incapability of realizing them. By depicting this contrast Ševčenko wanted to wash the silt off the psyches of the "little Russians" and to put before his eyes the treasure of his national dignity and ambition. He appealed to all sons and daughters of the enslaved country.

Ševčenko's second postulate was to *preserve and cherish the native Ukrainian languge:*

Ne curajâtes' toho slova,	Don't shun the word
Ščo maty spivala,	Your mother sang to you
Jak maloho vpovyvala,	While wrapping you in swaddling
Z malym rozmovljala	And spoke to you
Vozvelyču	When you were a little boy.
Malyx otyx ravib nimyx!	I extol
Ja na storoži kolo jix	Those little speechless slaves!
Postavlju slovo...	And I shall put the word
"Podražanije XI Psalmu"	On guard over them...
	"The Imitation of Psalm XI"

A language will die if the people do not use it. Many languages vanished from history precisely for that reason. Language is a great force. If the Ukrainian language dies, the substance of Ukrainian life and existence also will die. Ševčenko warns the Ukrainians against such a deplorable possiblity through the oppression of Ukrainian culture by Russia, and he puts over them as guard his word, the Ukrainian language.

A third Ševčenko's postulate was *brotherly love and love for Ukraine:*

Dobro najkraščeje na sviti—	The nicest good in the world
To bratoljubije	is brotherliness.
"Neofity"	"The Neophites"
Obnimite ž, braty moji,	Embrace, my brothers,
Najmenšoho brata;	Your most subservient brother;
Obminit'sja ž, braty moji,	Embrace, my brothers, one another.
Molju vas, blahaju...	I beg you, I beseech you...
"Poslanije"	"My friendly Epistle"

Svoju Ukrajinu ljubit'!	Love your Ukraine!
Ljubit' jiji... vo vremja ljute,	Love her...In hard times,
V ostannju tjažkuju minutu	In the last crucial minutes
Za neji Hospoda molit'!.	Pray to the Lord for her!
"Čy zijdemos znovu"	"Shall we meet again"

De v sercjax	Where there's no love
Dlja vitčyny nema ljubovy,	For fatherland —
Kaliky vbohi tam — ne ljude,	There are poor cripples,
Nikčemni u svojix dilax,	Brutal men; their deeds are useless,
I slava jix porǒznja bude.	And also empty is their fame.
"Hajdaj"	"Hajdaj"

Where there is brotherliness, there is harmony; where there is harmony, there is joint action, work for the general good, and success. Ševčenko believes that only a synthesis of brotherly love and love for Ukraine can solve the problem of social and economic injustice in Ukraine through sound social reforms motivating and promoting the growth of national strength and political independence. This goal could not be attained through a class-struggle and Marxian proletarian revolution which, later on, in the contemporary Soviet Union, Marxists-Leninists forcibly try to impose on Ševčenko's views.[2]

Study is the fourth of Ševčenko's postulate:

Učitesja, braty moji,	Learn, my brothers,
Dumajte, čytajte...	Think and read...
I čužomu nau*čajtes',*	Learn foreign thoughts,
Svoho ne curajtes'!	But don't shun your own country!
"Poslanije"	"My Friendly Epistle"

One fundamental area of knowledge which everyone should master is knowledge of the history of one's own nation. Lack of such knowledge was one of the main characteristics of the poet's countrymen.

[2] Ivan Romanč*enko, Atejism, T.H. Ševčenka,* Kyjiv, 1962; Ivan D. Nazarenko, *Suspil'no-politycni, filosofis'ki, estetyčni ta atejistyčni pohljady T.H. Ševčenka,* vyd. 2 dopov., Kyjiv: Vyd-vo xudožnjoji literatury, 1964; E.P. Kyryljuk, *Taras H. Ševčenko. Žyttja i twročist',* Kyjiv; Deržavne vyd-vo xudožnujoji literatury, 1959; and others.

Knowledge of the history and cultural achievements of the Ukrainian people, recommended by Ševčenko, would stimulate thoughts toward creative deeds for the general good of Ukraine, because "unforgettable deeds of our forefathers, hard deeds, created that history and embellished with a halo of glory the graves of its creators." It is necessary to know these graves, to analyze the lives of the great figures who rest in them in order to fill one's heart and mind with willingness to continue the heroic fight for freedom and liberty and become couragious continuators of the ideals of the Ukrainian forefathers. The knowledge of Ukraine's past would motivate her sons and daughters to self-criticism and to the use of objective criteria in evaluating "foreign wisdom." Ševčenko does not reject the idea of acquiring knowledge of foreign doctrines and cultural achievements. On the contrary, he encourages one to do just that. However, when acquiring such knowledge, it is necessary for Ukrainians to have their own wisdom and to use only those foreign ideas which are constructive with regard to the general good of Ukraine. What meets the spiritual and national needs of one nation need not necessarily meet those of other nations. With irony Ševčenko rejects the uncritical acceptance of foreign theories and slogans in the Ukrainian sphere of life:

Nimec' skaže: "Vy moholy",
—"Moholy, moholy,
Zolotoho Tamerlana
Unačata holi!"
Nimec' skaže: "Vy slovjany",
—"Slovjany, slovjany:
Slavnyx pradidiv velykyx
Pravnuky pohani!"
"Poslanije"

If the German says, "You're Mongols",
He gets answer, "Yes, we're Mongols",
Naked grandsons of the golden Tamerlan.[3]
If the German says, "You're Slavs",
He gets answer, "Yes, we're Slavs,[4]
Bad great-grandsons of the great
Famous great-grandfathers!"
"My Friendly Epistle"

Resistance to foreign rule in Ukraine is the fifth of Ševčenko's postulates expressed in his works, especially in his symbolic poem "Velykyj

[3] Tamerlan was Tartar's xan, commander of the so-called "Golden Horde", who once conquered many lands in Asia and approached Moscow. The attribute "golden" of the name "Golden Horde" was applied by Ševčenko to the khan of the "Golden Horde".

[4] They humilitate themselves, speak ironically of themselves, thinking that this would appeal to the German.

L'ox" (The Big Cellar), where three souls are doomed to suffer for their sins.

The first soul's sin is this: On Sunday, early in the morning, she ran to the creek for water. On her way she saw the hetman with his sergeant major. The girl got her water and, with pail full crossed the road, not knowing that hetman was riding to Perejaslav to swear an oath to the Russian tsar.[5] With difficulty, she brought the water to the house. With that "cursed water" she poisoned her father, mother, brother, herself and the dogs. For that sin she has to suffer: her sisters do not allow her to come to paradise. This symbolic picture denotes Bohdan Xmel'nyc'kyj's oath to the tsar in Perejasalv in 1654. That oath brought grist to Russian mill which began grinding the life of all the members of girl's family, the latter symbolizing the whole Ukrainian nation.

The second soul in this poem is not allowed to get to paradise because she watered the tsar's horse in Baturin on his way from Poltava to Moscow.[6] After the destruction of Baturin[7] "only one house was saved" where tsar was to pass the night. The girl was passing by that house and the tsar told her to water his horse, which she did, not knowing that she "was committing a serious sin. Now she expiates for that sin by flying above the Cossack ravines and steppes." The soul in this picture personifies those Ukrainians who, in Mazepa's battle against tsar Peter the Great, betrayed Mazepa and joined the tsar. As a result of the betrayal Ukraine became enslaved by Russia.

The third soul is chastised because, when she saw Catherina II, emperor of Russia, sitting among the princes in the Kaniv gallery by the Dnipro river, the girl smiled.

[5] To cross the road with full pail of water denoted: to predict good fortune for the rider (or passer-by). Here, the girl, Prisja, was not aware of Xmel'nyc'kyj's plan of going to Perejaslav to swear oath to the Russian tsar, but she should have. Thus, ignorance was the sin for which she and the whole generation must suffer.

[6] In the battle by the city of Poltava, in Ukraine, the Russian army defeated the Ukrainian army of hetman Ivan Mazepa in 1709. To water somebody's horse meant to be well-wishing to the owner. Here watering tsar's horse meant wishing well to the tsar, the enemy of the free and independent Ukraine.

[7] The town of Baturin was the capital of hetman Ivan Mazepa.

Čy ja znala ščę spovyta,	Could I have known in swaddling-clothes
Ščo taja carycja —	That that tsarina
Ljutyj voroh Ukrajiny,	Was savage enemy of Ukraine,
Holodna vovčycja?	A hungry she-wolf?

Of course, if one has done something wrong from the standpoint of morality but has not been aware that the action was immoral, one should not be punished. The child in swaddling-clothes was innocent, unable to discriminate between good and evil. Her soul's joy was caused by her ignorance in not knowing who Catherina was. She was not yet able to read the tsarina's crafty mind, devilish plans with regard to Ukraine. Why then does the poet punish her after her death for what was not her fault? By this picture Ševčenko wants to vitalize to the fullest extent possible the national and political conscience of all Ukrainians. In order to shock them out their national and political ignorance he warns them of the consequences of their "smiling" in the face of the Russian autocratic ruling in Ukraine.

All these symbolic pictures, as well as the pictures of the three lyrists of the poem, present Ševčenko's unequivocal postulate that the Ukrainian people should build their national, political and state life with their own resources and power, not in federation with Russia under her autocratic hostile control.

Ševčenko's sixth postulate is *constructive work for Ukraine.*

Ščob zbudyt'	In order to arouse
Xyrennu volju,	The stickly liberty,
Treba myrom, hromadoju	You must steel the butt[8]
Obux stalyt'	In harmony, all together.
"Ja ne nezdužaju nivroku"	"I feel so-so"

Bratija, ne vdavajtes' v tuhu,	Brothers, do not grieve,
a molites' Bohu i pracjujte	but pray to God and work
rozumno vo imja materi	wisely in the name of our
našoji Ukrajiny beztalannoji.	mother, ill-fated Ukraine.
"Peredmova do 2-ho vyd. Kobzarja, 1847"	"Preface to the 2nd ed. of Kobzar, 1847"

[8] Normally a *butt* is not made of steel; by this phrase Ševčenko means a rifle "butt as strong as steel".

Work for Ukraine must be wise, harmonious and communal. With this postulate Ševčenko condemns useless factional quarrels, urging them instead of fighting each other to "steel the butt" for the common goal in the name of the enslaved Ukraine.

Ševčenko's seventh postulate is *the struggle for liberty and faith in victory*:

Boritesja, poborete,	Struggle and you'll conquer,
Vam Boh pomahaje,	God gives you His blessing,
Za vas syla, za vas volja	On your side is strength and freedom
I pravda svjataja.	And the holy truth.
"Kavkaz"	"The Caucasus"

In this political poem Ševčenko sympathizes with Čerkassian fighters for freedom against imperial Russian oppression. However he did not intend to stimulate Ukrainians to armed confrontation with Russia at that time. Such a confrontation would have been doomed. Instead he tries to encourage them to undertake the thorough building and development of their forces in order to make a successful armed fight possible when the suitable time comes. He believed that such a fight in its final stage would bring victory and an independent Ukrainian state, only provided the Ukrainians attain a high level of national strength and political wisdom:

Zitxannja naši neveseli	Our sorrowful sighs
Z nesytistju kativ umrut',	Will die with death
I nas svjatyj zakon i pravo	Of greedy deeds of hangmen,
V stepax šyrokyx ožyvut'.	And our sacred law and right
	Will come to life in vasty steppes.

That sacred law and rights based on it should be the law of George Washington, that is, Democracy:

Koly my diždemosja Wašingtona	When shall we get George Washington
Z novym i pravednym zakonom?	With new and righteous law?
A diždemosja taky kolys'.	And we shall get him after all.
"Jurodyvyj"	"The 'God's Fool'"

The establishment of democracy in Ukraine is Ševčenko's eighth postulate. The term "democracy" in Ševčenko's view would have its full realization in a pluralistic system of national, political and social life for all the citizens of Ukraine.

Ševčenko's ninth postulate for reviving and developing the strength of his nation is *faith in God and recognition of the moral and ethical principles of the Christian world-view.* This postulate is fundamental for all other postulates.

Prebezumnyj v serci skaže,	Only the fool will to his heart
Ščo Boha nemaje,	Declare there is no God
V bezzakoniji merzije,	As he grows foul in lawlessness
Ne tvoryt' blahaja.	And walks in evil shod.
"Psalom LII"	"Psalm LII" (tr. A-n & K-11)[9]

Odynoka vidrada moja teper — se jevanhelije.
Ja čytaju joho ščodnja, ščohodyny.
"Lysty, Do Repninoji, 7.III. 1850"

(My only delight now is the Gospel.
I read it everyday, every hour.)
"Letters. To Repnina, March 7, 1850"

Thus, Ševcenko recognizes God and Christ's teaching as Absolute Truth, not Nitzsche's cosmic will and the volitional driving force of individual and collective organizations. Only the truth of the Absolute Power, God and Christ, is for Ševčenko a constructive truth and a source of strength, inspiration and direction in moral and ethical relationship among individual and peoples.

These are Ševčenko's main postulates proclaimed in his poems, letters, and diary and practiced by him in his relatively short life. Ševčenko was neither a political organizer nor a propagandist of a party ideology or a system; therefore he did not squeeze these postulates into a programmatic frame. This was not his task. He, the poet of genius, the best emanation of the spirit of Ukraine, a nation-wide greatness with an

[9] See: "Religious and Moral-Ethical Tenets of Taras Ševčenko", *Selected Papers on Slavic Studies* by Wasyl Jaszczun.

exceptionally deep comprehension of the possiblities for reviving and developing the Ukrainian nation on the road of its historical mission, places these postulates before the people's mind and heart so that they might realize them and fulfil that mission. These postulate — ideals are clear, alive and mobilizing, because they are natural, desirable and indispensable to every individual and every nation.

Тарас Шевченко в світлі “індивідуалізму” і “персоналізму”

(TARAS ŠEVČENKO IN THE LIGHT OF “INDIVIDUALISM” AND “PERSONALISM”)

Теорії індівідуалізму і персоналізму з їх різнородними галузями віддзеркалені в численних мистецьких, публіцистичних і наукових творах, причому в одних творах переважають течії індивідуалізму, в інших — персоналізму, а ще в інших можна зустріти певну мішанину обох напрямів. Цього питання в стосунку до Шевченка ще не розглянено досіль, тому ця стаття, на думку її автора, буде скромним причинком до вже наявного багатства досліджених тем про безсмертного Кобзаря.

Про індивідуалізм і персоналізм написано в 20-ому столітті багато книг і трактатів різними мовами, особливо ж англійською, німецькою, французькою, італійською і російською. Замітніші серед них — це праця Варнера Фіте про формальні принципи індивідуалізму, “Соціялізм і індивідуалізм” Сидні Вебба і Бернарда Шова, “Метафізичні досліди над індивідом і особою” Джорджа МекМоррова, “Надлюдина і звичайна людина” Беджаміна Барбера, “Індивідуалізм і націоналізм в американській ідеології” Єгошуа Арієлі, “Суб'єкт і його власність” Макса Штіпнера, “Персоналізм” Бордена П. Бовна, “Рабсто і свобода людини” Николая Бердяєва, “Анатомія особовости” Доналюда Адамса і чимало інших. Проте ці два поняття, особливо ж поняття персоналізму, ще не зовсім проникли в свідомість сучасної пересічної культурної людини. Окреслення “індивідуальність” і “особистість” у щоденному мововжитку зви-

чайно мають синонімічне значення. Тому спершу я постараюсь коротко окреслити зміст цих двох понять та вказати на різниці між ними.

Як відомо, слово "індивідуалізм" походить від латинського слова "індівідуум" себто неподільна сутність. Індивід — це окрема людина. Індивідуалізм — це одна із світоглядових віток натуралізму, базованого на раціоналізмі і позитивізмі. В індивідуалізмі наголошено егоїзм і егоцентризм у контрасті до альтруїзму. На перший плян висунено "я" індивіда з його особистими інтересами в протилежність інтересам суспільности. Це "я" є центром світогляду людини.

Позитивними рисами індивідуалізму є визнання, що всі люди з морального погляду є собі рівні і тому одна людина не може бути трактована як засіб до добробуту іншої людини. Другою додатковою рисою тієї течії є признання кожній людині якнайбільше свободи і відповідальности в її виборі і досягненні цілей, бо це стимулює її ініціятиву і розвиток її ресурсів, що причиняється до росту добробуту суспільности. При цьому цей напрям поручає пошану прав кожної людини. З цього погляду суспільність — це збірнота людей, в якій кожна одиниця є вільною і самобутньою істотою.

Неґативним явищем індивідуалізму є підтримка, яку знаходить у ньому індивід в оцінюванні загального добра. Таке добро він розглядає під кутом особистої користи. Він намагається здійснювати свої цілі навіть тоді, коли вони йдуть урозріз з загальним добром спільноти. Такі, напр., гасла, як "Праця єдина з неволі нас вирве" і "Думай, що на тобі мільйонів стан стоїть і за долю мільйонів мусиш дати ти одвіт" у їх правильному, суспільно-національному значенні не знаходять поселення в розумово-психічній ляботорії істоти індивідуаліста. Зміст цих гасел у такому розумінні може й дійде до слуху індивіда, але зупиниться лише на периферіях його "я" і відлетить звідтіль, не залишивши зародку життя. Бо індивідуаліст, працюючи для влаштування собі вигідного життя (що звичайно є його головною метою) не має розвинутого почуття морального обов'язку поставити свою працю в кореляцію з добром вужчої і ближчої йому спільноти — власного народу та шир-

шої спільноти-людства. Обидві ці категорії є для нього лише засобом до осягання його особистих цілей.

Іншим неґативним паростком індивідуалізму є еготизм. Це перебільшена думка про себе, про свою гідність і значення та звичка цю думку висловлювати. Еготист зарозумілий і чванливий. Він влюблений в себе і не бажає бачити своїх недоліків. Для експанзії свого "я" він користується самореклямою, і інколи буває, що він навіть присвоює собі престижевий титул для само-утвердження свого "я", дарма що для такого титулу не має ні кваліфікацій, ні формально-морального права.

Сягаючи своїм корінням натуралістичного світогляду, індивідуалізм вилучує з обсягу свого теоретично-практичного зацікавлення метафізику, тому його послідовники не виходять поза межі емпіризму і переважно є атеїстами.

Ці риси характерні для уміркованого індивідуалізму. Та цей філософічний напрям може прибирати й більш неґативний вид у залежності від якости цілей, що їх ставить перед собою індивід, та натуги його егоїстично-егоцентричних і еготичних сил, які мотивують і внапрямлюють шлях до осягання тих цілей. Визнавши одиноким джерелом моралі і етики для своїх дій своє "я", такий індивід при сприятливих зовнішніх умовах може переступати межі справедливої свободи і чинити сваві́льство у відношенні до інших осіб, інституцій і суспільства, до якого він належить, а ще більше до чужого суспільства чи народу. Такий крайній вид мав індивідуалізм Макса Штірнера та його послідовника Ніцше. Індивідуалістична доктрина цього останнього значно причинилась до спустошення і нелюдських дій німецьких нацистів на окупованих ними землях східньої Европи.

Індивідуалістичний напрям виринув в Англії. В половині 17 ст. Томас Гоббс розвинув радикально індивідуалістичну, але при цьому й авторитарну, філософію, а згодом, при кінці того століття, Джон Льок розвинув широко впливове вчення про природні права і політичну рівність індивідів. Після успішного розвитку в Англії в 19 ст. розвиток індивідуалістичних ідей до певної міри занепав при кінці того століття й на початку 20 ст., бо почали набирати впливу нові суспільні течії, колективні, протилежні індивідуалізмові.

Слово "персоналізм" — це умовне окреслення, однак більшість філософів розуміють під ним учення про людську особистість, про особистість як основне буття і основну цінність. Це слово походить від латинського "персона", яке спочатку означало маску, що її давні актори носили на лиці під час театральних представлень. Однак слово "персона" перейшло складний семантично-лексичний розвиток і в кінцевій його стадії стало означати щось зовсім протилежне масці, а саме, особистість людини, її внутрішню, духову сутність.

У відрізненні від індивідуалізму з його паростками — егоїзмом, егоцентризмом і еготизмом, унапрямленими на самоутвердження індивідуального "я" і на протиставлення його суспільності, персоналізм цінує людську особистість у всій повноті її атрибутів. Хоч центром особистости визнає він, як і індивідуалізм, індивідуальне "я", то вважає, що буття особистости було б неповне, якби це "я" не включилося в суспільність і не мало зв'язків з іншими "я". Тому персоналізм надає великого значення спілкуванню в протилежність індивідуалізмові, який веде індивіда радше до самовідокремлення і цінить спілкування лише як засіб до осягнення особистих цілей індивіда.

Обидва філософічні вчення цінять свободу. Однак індивідуалізм наголошує в ній завжди "я" індивіда, а персоналізм — бажання служити суспільству та іншим індивідам. І індивідуаліст, і персоналіст бажають творити. Однак перший із них здійснює це бажання для самоутвердження, а в другого воно виходить поза межі його "я" і закреслює широкий круг, яким охоплює інші індивіди і збірноту та ввесь нарід. Саме ця трансцендентність є, мабуть, найбільш характерна риса особистости, бо в ній людина перемагає обмеженість самоутвердження свого "я" і входить у сферу вищих цінностей.

В будові особистости можна відзначити три головні психічні зони: підсвідомість, свідомість із центром "я" і надсвідомість. Підсвідомість — це зона невизначених, неясних, не зовсім усвідомлених понять, ідей, настроїв, почувань тощо. Це головно різні інстинкти, які натискають на свідомість і нерідко її перемагають. Вище стоїть сама свідомість "я", центр індивідуальности і особистости, який керує інстинктами. Понад ним є надсвідомість, джерело

різноманітних надхнень, голосу совісти, зона контакту з Богом. Ця зона незбагненна людським розумом і мало досліджена психологією, бо науково дослідити таємні функції її природи неможливо. Однак ця зона реально існує, як реально існує зона підсвідомости і свідомого "я".

Персоналізм — це звичайно вчення ідеалістичне, хоч може бути й реалістичне. Персоналісти є звичайно теїстами, рідко атеїстами. Основоположником персоналізму вважають Ґотфріда Вільгельма Ляйбніца (17-18 ст.), німецького філософа і математика, і Джорджа Берклі (18 ст.), ірляндського церковного служителя. Теорії персоналізму знайшли сприятливий ґрунт у Франції в 18-19 ст. В Америці розвинули його філософи релігії в 19-20 ст., головно Борден Паркер Бовн.

Що з філософії обох течій знаходимо в Шевченка? Був Шевченко індивідуалістом, персоналістом чи одним і другим?

Аналіза його поезій, оповідань і "Дневника" вказує на те, що в його постаті злились позитивні риси індивідуалізму з сумою властивостей персоналізму. Поскільки в філософії індивідуалізму позитивних рис мало і вони збігаються з особливостями персоналізму, можна сказати, що Шевченко являє собою тип практичного персоналіста.

Людина, пройнята неґативними настановами індивідуалізму, може стати невільником настроїв, почувань і думок, які поселились в її підсвідомій зоні і тиснуть на її самоутверджувальне "я". Інстинкти грають важливу ролю в процесі формування остаточних думок і рішень кожної людини. Та персоналіст своїм свідомим "я" робитиме розсудливу селекцію тих інстинктів з розрахунком їх позитивного стосунку до інших осіб та до спільноти національної і ширшої спільноти — людства в протилежність до егоцентричного індивідуаліста, який робитиме цей вибір виключно для особистої матеріяльної користи або для пустого гонору. Інстинктовні спокуси користолюбія зовнішнього світу влітали теж у підсвідомість поета та намагались втиснутись в центр його свідомости, в його "я", і пропонували йому зробити рішення їх прийняти. Однак Шевченкове "я" їх поборол непримиренним "караюсь, мучусь, але не каюсь". Цей шлях страдальця він вибрав не для самоствердження

свого "я", а для облегшення страждання своїх найближчих ближніх — синів і дочок поневоленої України. Не прийняв ворожого "теплого кожуха" бо той кожух був "не на нього шитий". У конфронтації з "власть імущими", спричиненій поневоленням його батьківщини, він ніколи не висував себе, індивіда, на перший плян, а свій нарід, запряжений у "тяжкі ярма" чужими і своїми. В рядах національно-політичних поневолювачів його братів і сестер були російські автократи, а кліщі соціяльно-економічної неволі кували для них з благословення Москви таки свої земляки. І одні, і другі були носіями неґативних комплексів індивідуалізму, проти якого цілою своєю істотою виступив персоналіст Шевченко, громлячи не тільки царський деспотизм, формалізм і поліційність та лицемірство російської православної церкви, але й ставлячи розпачливо закиди тим своїм землякам, що сами носили кайдани і їх накладали на "меншого брата" ("міняються кайданами"), що практикували аморальність, брехню, лицемірство, несправедливість та порушували етичні закони ("правдою торгують і Господа зневажають"), що не шанували своєї рідної мови та не бажали розкрити могили своїх предків, щоб пізнати правду про Україну.

Індивідуалістичний егоїзм земляків викликав у Шевченка почуття болючого сарказму ("За шмат гнилої ковбаси у них хоч матір попроси"), а їх еготизм і пиха — почуття обурення і гидоти:

Якби ви вчились так, як треба,
То й мудрість би була своя.
А то залізете на небо:
"І ми — не ми, і я — не я,
І все те бачив, все те знаю,
Нема ні пекла, ані раю,
Немає Бога, *тільки я*
Та куций німець узловатий,
А більш нікого...

Не був поет і еготистом. Хоч феноменом розуміння становища свого народу в минулому, сучасному та з проєкцією в майбутнє він переріс усіх сучасних йому українців і відчував важливість своєї місії в тому становищі і цю місію жертвенно виконував, то пеанів для себе за це не бажав і ні йоти зарозумілости й чванливости не вплів в поетичні і прозові рядки своїх писань.

У контрасті до егоїзму, егоцентризму і еготизму згаданої категорії індивідуалістів ясніє принадністю альтруїзм Шевченка: його безкорисна турбота про добро усіх своїх земляків, всього народу, готовість жертвувати для них своїм життям. "Так щиро, так глибоко любити нарід, як любив його Шевченко — каже О. Кониський — й дивитися, як той нарід мордують — це велика мука для благородної душі. Це трута, що не тільки серце проймає до самого дна, але й увесь організм чоловіка труїть, робить йому немилим весь світ".

Транцендентність Шевченкового "я" в сферу любови інших сягає не тільки загального добра, блага для всього народу — його життя у вільній і демократичній Україні; вона сягає кожної знедоленої української людини та не відсуває поза межі свого засягу також не-українців. "...Його добрі сльози лилися за Катрусею в московській дорозі, молилися з козаками в турецькій неволі. Його сльози-слова ллються над недолею сироти, матері, покритки, байстрят, наймички, кріпачки. Відчував він усяку людську кривду, нікчемність, підлість, облуду і усі вчинки, противні християнській етиці" (С. Смаль-Стоцький, *Т. Шевченко — Інтерпретації,* УНІ, Варшава, 1934).

Індивідуаліст може почуватися щасливим і тоді, коли навкруги нього багато нещасливих. Персоналіст, навпаки, бачить своє щастя у щасті ближніх, особливо в щасті свого народу. Таким, саме, був Шевченко. До нього можна застосувати слова І. Мірчука, коли він обговорює питання зацікавлення слов'ян до філософської думки. "Слов'яни — каже він — не цікавляться питанням теорії пізнання, його можливости і границі, але цікавляться людиною, її долею, її життям і суттю цього життя. Тому слов'янські філософи — це філософи практичні, ідеалісти, чи інакше — філософи серця". Філософія серця — це паросток філософії теїстично-етичного персоналізму. Філософом серця в слові і дії був Шевченко.

Шевченко був не лише теїстом, він був глибоко віруючим християнином. Християнська релігія об'єднує в собі позитивні риси індивідуалізму і персоналізму. Це найкраще віддзеркалюється в її заповіді "люби ближнього свого, як себе самого". Нормально немає людини, яка би себе ненавиділа. Кожна нормальна людина се-

бе любить, бо це природний закон, і рівень тієї любови є звичайно вищий від рівня любови до свого ближнього. Підвищити цей рівень так, щоб він збігався з рівнем любови самого себе, доволі важко. Це ідеал, накреслений Христом. До цього ідеалу кожний християнин повинен прямувати (було б добре, якби й нехристияни цінили цей ідеал). Проте лиш одиниці його досягають. Це ті, що готові віддати своє життя за своїх ближніх. А ближніми є передусім члени рідного народу. Віддати своє життя для того, щоб жили брати й сестри рідного народу і ввесь нарід — це героїзм, якому дорівнює лише мученича смерть за віру Христа. В обох цих видах героїзму відсутня натуралістична основа і неґативні особливості індивідуалізму, а його позитивні риси вплетені в повновладну філософію вищої міри — персоналізм. Шевченко був особистістю, героїзм якої розвивався і дозрів у цій філософії, хоч теоретичні настанови і опрацювання тієї філософії (як і філософії індивідуалізму) не були Шевченкові відомі і він не вчився їх із книг і трактатів.

ДОПОМІЖНА ЛІТЕРАТУРА

1. Allport, G.W., *Personality: A Psychological Interpretation,* New York, 1937.
2. Arieli, Yegoshua, *Individualism and Nationalism in American Ideology,* Cambridge, Harvard University Press, 1964.
3. Berdjaev, Nikolai, *The Destiny of Man,* tr. by N. Duddington, London, 1937.
4. Bowne, Borden P., *Personalism,* Boston, 1908.
5. Bertocci, P.A., and Millard, A.M., *Personality and the God,* New York, 1963.
6. Brightman, E.S., "Personalism (Including Personal Idealism)", in V. Ferm, ed., *A History of Philosophical System,* New York, 1950.
7. Fite, Warner, *An Adventure of Moral Philosophy,* London, Methuen, 1926.
8. Flewelling, R.T., "Personalism", in D.D. Runes, ed. *Twentieth Century Philosophy,* New York, 1947.
9. Hobbes, Thomas, *Body, Man, and Citizen. Selection,* New York, 1962.
10. Hobbes, Thomas, *Leviatan* (parts one and two), with an Introduction by Herbert W. Schneider, Indianapolis, 1958.
11. Inge, William R., *Personal Idealism and Mysticism,* London, New York, 1924.

12. Kavka, Gregory S., *Hobbesian Moral and Political Theory,* Princeton University Press, 1986.
13. Knudson, Albert C., *The Philosophy of Personalism. A Study in the Metaphysics of Religion,* New York, 1927.
14. Leibniz, Gottfried W., *Gott, Geist, Gute;* eine Auswahl aus seinen Werken; Gutersloh, C. Bertelsmann, 1947.
15. Locke, John, *An Essay Concerning Human Understanding,* Menston, 1970.
16. Maritain, J., *The Person and Common Good,* tr. J.J. Fitzgerald, New York, 1947.
17. Mc Morrow, George J., *A Metaphysical Study on the Individual and Person,* Notre Dame, Ind., 1940.
18. Mounier, Emmanuel, *Personalism,* tr. by Philip Mairet, London, 1952.
19. Schmidt, Johann Kasper (Pseud. Shtirner, Maks), *The Ego and His Own,* London, 1971.

Aus dem Nikolauskulte in der volkloristischen und religiösen Literatur in der Ukraine

In diesdem Artikel versuchte ich die Geschichtlichkeit der Gestalt des heiligen Nikolaus und die Entstehung seines Kultes auf ukrainischem Boden zu besprechen.

Wir besitzen nur sehr spärliche geschichtliche Angaben über das Leben dieses Heiligen. Daher war seine Person stets in einen undurchsichtigen Nebelschleier gehüllt und bildete ein fruchtbares Feld für Entstehung zahlloser Legendon.

Nach Karl Fissen soll Nikolaus von Myra unter Kaiser Konstantin (323-337) gelebt, am Konzil von Nizäa (325) teilgenommen haben und am 6. Dezember 343 gestorben sein[1]. Aus dem Lexikom von Johann Stadler erfahren wir, dass der hl. Nikolaus laut glaubwürdigen Quellen in Patara in Lykien geboren sei[2]. Nach Jacobus de Veragine wurde der hl. Nikolaus in der Stadt Patara geboren und hatte eine reiche und fromme Verwandschaft. Sein Vater hiess Epiphanius und seine Mutter Johanna. Nachdem Jacobus zählt die Wundertaten auf, die sich noch im Leibesleben des Hieligen und nach seinem Tode zugetragen haben

[1] Karl Fissen, *Das Leben des heiligen Nikolaus in der altfranzösischen Literatur und seine Quellen* (Go³ttingen, 1921).

[2] Johann Evang. Stadler, *Vollständiges Heiligenlexikon,* 14, S. 547.

sollen[3]. Karl Meisen dagegen behauptet, dass die geschichtliche Person des hl. Nikolaus ähnlich wie bei den anderen grossen volkstümlichen Heiligengestalten der griechischen Kirche (Theodoros, Demetrios, Georgios) "in undurchdringliches Dunkel gehüllt sei." Gleichzeitig führt er jedoch die Worte Anrichs an, dass es ein metodischer Fehler wäre, die Geschichtlichkeit des Myrensischen Bischofs Nikolaus darum in Abrede zu stellen[4]. Die Verfasser kirchengeschichtlicher Werke, wie Albert Hauk[5] und Karl Krunbacher[6], erwähnen bloss den Namen des Heiligen. Nach Hauk wurde der Name des hl. Nikolaus mit einem Glorienschein umgeben. Von vielen Kirchengeschichtlern wird er überhaupt nicht erwähnt.

Die Verfasser der Patrologien umgehen grösstenteils die Frage über die Gerschichtlichkeit der Person des hl. Nikolaus; sie setzen die Existenz des Heiligeneinfach als Tatsache voraus, sprechen von seiner Anteilnahme am Konzil von Nizäa und seiner Rolle als Verteidiger des wahren katholischen Glaubens.

Seltene sind auch die Angaben über den Myrensischen Bischof aus Lykien in den weltlichen Geschichtsbüchern, da diese die kirchlichen Angelegenheiten nur im Zusammenhang mit den staatlich-politischen Ereignissen und gesellschaftlichen Beziehungen behandeln. Die Frage über die Geschichtlichkeit des Bischofs, dessen Verehrung zum Weltkult wurde, hat daher in den Geschichtsbüchern nebensächliche Bedeutung. Sie wird von der Erforschern des Nikolauskultes und in den Lebensbeschreibungen des Heiligen nur nebenbei erwähnt.

Um jedoch einer genaueren Aufschluss über die Person des hl. Nikolaus als eine geschichtliche Gestalt zu gewinnen, müssen wir die ältesten Forschungsquellen einer Betrachtung unterziehen. Als ältestes

[3] Jacobus de Veragine, *Legenda Aurea;* in English translation: *The Golden Legend or Lives of the Saints* as englished by William Caxton (AMS Press, New York, 1973), S. 110 und weiter.

[4] Karl Meisen, *Nikolauskult und Nikolausbrauch im Abendlande*, Heft 9-12 (Düsseldorf, 1931), S. 51.

[5] *Krichengeschischte Deutschlands,* 1 Teil (Leipzig, 1922), S. 185-225.

[6] *Geschichte der Byzantinischen Literatur von Justinian bis zum Ende des Oströmischen Reiches 527-1453* (München, 1891), S. 411.

Dokument dieser Art kann die Beschreibung des Lebens und der Wundertaten des hl. Nikolaus durch den Patriarchen Methodios von Konstantinopel (842-846) dienen. In der ältesten lateinischen Übersetzung der Arbeit des Methodios durch Johannes Diaconus heisst es: "Nicolaus ex illustri prosapia ortus civis fuit Patarae urbis quae una ex nobilissimis Lyciae provinciae civitatibus"[7]. Der Verfasser äussert sich hier positiv über die Geschichtlichkeit der Person des hl. Nikolaus. Er sagt nicht *videtur* oder *narratur* Nicolaus civis fuisse, sondern Nicolaus civis *fuit*.

Einen klaren Beweis dafür, dass der Bischof von Myra in Lykien eine wahre geschichtliche Person und keine erdachte Gestalt ist, bildet die Tatsache, dass die sterblichen Überreste desselben im Jahre 1087 aus Lykien in Kleinasien nach Bari in Italien überführt wurden. Wir sind im Besitz genauer Angaben über den Verlauf dieses Eriegnisses. Im Jahre 1071 verlor Byzanz die Entscheidungsschlacht gegen die Türken bei Mantzikert. Die Sieger drangen in Kleinastien ein. Lykien wurde verwüstet, die Bevölkerung ausgeplündert und vernichtet. Die Bewohner der Stadt Myra flohen in die Berge. Diese Gelegenheit benützten italienische Kaufleute und überführten die Gebeine des Heiligen nach ihrer Heimatstadt Bari. Dieses Ereignis trug sich am 8. Mai 1087 zu. Die Anregung dazu ging von dem Benediktiner Mönch Elias aus. Am 1. Oktober 1089 segnete Papst Urban II (1088-1099) den Altar der Kirche zu Ehren des Heiligen. In einem Schriftstück aus der Zeit zwischen 1150 bis 1200 sind sogar die Namen der Expeditionsteilnehmer nach Myra enthalten. Wir finden diese Mitteilung in *God. dipl. Barese V,* Nr. 164, S. 278 ff. Der name eines Teilnehmer, Leo Pilillus, wird bereits 1105 in einem Schreiben erwähnt, in welchem dieser nach "quin-quaginta solidos michalatos" über die Rechte und Privilegien resigniert, die ihm als Expeditionsteilnehmer in der Kirche des hl. Nikolaus in Bari gebührten.

Die Beschreibung der Überführung der sterblichen Überreste des hl. Nikolaus nach Bari finden wir sowohl in Italien, z.B. von Nikiphorus der Kleriker, von Archidiaconus Johannes[8], als auch in der Ukraine von

[7] Johannes Diaconus, *Vita beati Nicolai episcopi* (Neapel), S. 267.

[8] Karl Meisen, *Nikolauskult*.... (s. Anm. 4), S. 94.

einem unbekannten Verfasser, dessen Beschreibung unter dem Titel" 9 maja. Slovo poxval'no na prenesenie moščej iže vo svjatyx otca našeho Nikoly, arxiepiskopa mirlikijskaho" beginnt mit den Worten:" Se nasta bratie[9]... und die zweite "Měsjaca maja v 9-j den' pamjat' prenesenija moščej svjataho otca našeho Nikoly arxiepiskopa myrskaho v Barhrad" mit den Worten:" Prisno ubo[10]...

Da nun derart genaue Angaben über den Verlauf der Überführung der sterblichen Überreste des Myrensischen Bischofs Nikolaus erhalten geblieben sind, und diese Ereignis eine so starke Wiederspielung in der kirchlichen Literatur gerfunden hat, so ist wohl anzunehmen, dass ein solches Ereignis sich tatsächlich zugetragen hat. Der hl. Nikolaus ist also eine Gestalt, die der geschichtlichen Wahreit entspricht. Daher schliest die Tatsache, dass unsere Kenntnis der Gestalt des Heiligen sich in erster Linie auf legedäre Überlieferungen stützt, keinesfalls die Möglichkeit aus, dass der Bischof Nikolaus von Myra wirklich gelebt hat.

Diese Schlussfolgerung lässt sich leicht an einer Reihe der Beispiele nachweisen. Im ukrainischen Volke, z.B. ist die Legende vom heiligen Andreas (sv. Andrej) verbreitet, der auf den Kiever Bergen ein Kreuz errichtet und den einstigen Ruhm dieses Ortes verkündet haben soll. Inwiefern diese Legende nun auch war sein mag, aber der Apostel Andreas hat tatsächlich gelebt. Ebenso können die Legenden über den hl. Nikolaus sich entweder als reine Phantasiegebilde oder als geschichtliche Wahrheiten erweisen, allein in beidn Fallen bildet geschichtliche Nikolaus die Person, die den Stoff zur Schaffung der Legenden geliefert hat.

Die Wundertaten des Heiligen brachten ihm den gewaltigen Ruhm, der sich über die gesamte christliche Welt verbreitet hat. Dieser Ruhm fand seinen Ausdruck im literarischen und küunstlerischen Schaffen in den verschiedensten Sprachen und Stilepochen. Die Gestalt des Heiligen

[9] N. Nikol'skij, *Materialy dlja povremennogo spiska russkix pisatelej i ix sočinenij X-XU vv.* (St. Petersburg, 19006), S. 304. In diesem Artikel ist die wissenschaftliche Transkription für die kirchenslavischen Worte gebraucht.

[10] Ibidem, S. 314.

drang tief in die Seelen der Gläubigen ein, und zwar nicht nur bei einwzelnen Gesellschaftsschichten, sondern in allen Ständen, Berufs-uns Altersklassen. Diese grossen Erfolge konnte der Heilige nur als geschichtliche Persönlichkeit und nicht als Phantasiegestalt erringen. Jegliche anderen Annahmen waren widersinning and würden, ob früher oder später, aufgeklärt worden sein und wären aus den Gesichtskreis des christlichen Glaubens verschwunden. Es trat jedoch genau das Gegenteil einer solchen Annahme ein, die Nikolausverehrung wurde zum weiterverbreitesten Heiligenkult.

In der Geschichte begegnen wir ausser dem Myrensischen Nikolaus in Lykien noch einem zweiten gleichnamigen Heiligen, dem Pinarischen Nikolaus. Aller Wahrscheinlichkeit nach wurde das Leben and Wirken beider gewissermassen in den Überlieferungen durcheinandergewürfelt.

Nikolaus[11] von Myra in Lykien[12] lebte zur Zeit der Kaiser Diokletianus und Konstantin[13] und stammte aus der Stadt Patara[14] der Proving Lykien in Kleinasien. Seine Eltern Epiphanius und Johanna zeichneten sich durch besondere Frömmigkeit aus und übertrugen dieselbe auch auf ihren Sohn. Als Kanabe überstand er um 300 eine schwere Krankheit[15].

[11] In Volksumnd klingt der Name auch Nykola, Mykola, Mykolaj. Die etymologische Bedeutung dieses Names ist folgende: nichos (Sieg) + laos (Leute), das ist der Sieg über menschliche Sünden.

[12] In den kirchenslavischen Beschreibungen des Lebens und der Überführung der sterblichen Üderreste des hl. Nikolaus finden sich in den Überschriften und einleitenden Sätzen folgende Termine: arxiepiskop Mir Likijskix, arxiepiskop mirskija eparxii, arxiepiskop mjuskyja Lukija, episkop murjstěi Lukii, otъ mjur'skaho hrada, otъ mir'skaho hrada, otъ Mir,... svjataho mirlikijskaho episkopa, Mir Likyja (N. Nikol'skij, *Materialy...*, S. 359-360).

[13] Die Schilderung des 6. Dezember unter dem Titel "Pamjat' prepodobnoho otca našeho Nikoly, arxiepiskopa mjurskyja Lukija" beginnt mit den Worten: "V carstvo velikaho Konstantina byst' toj velikyj arxierej..." Eine andere Schilderung unter dem Titel "Dějanie svjataho otca Nikoly arxiepiskopa" beginnt also: "Byst' vo vrěmja Konstantina velikaho cesarja..." (N. Nikol'skij, *Materialy...*, S. 363).

[14] Johannes Diaconus, *Vita beati...* (s. Anm. 7), S. 267: "civis fuit Patarae". In den lateinischen Übersetzungen findet man überall "Patara. In der *Vitae Metaphraste et aliis,* collecta a Leonardo Justianiano, I, Lipomanni et apud Surium 6 Dec., S. 368, sagt man: "6. dekabrja, život iže vo sv. otca našeno Nikoly arxiepiskopa mirlikijskaho. Parata (Para, Tatara) jest' město v zemli Likii, v kotorom sja urodyl sv. Nikolaj".

[15] Johann Evang. Stadler (s. Anm. 2), S. 547.

Unter dem Kaiser Diokletianus soll er ins Gefängnis geworfen und unter Konstantin wieder befreit worden sein[16]. Sein Oheim Nikolaus war Bischof in Myra. Nach dem Tode des nächstfolgenden Bischofs, Johannes, wurde er zum Bischof von Myra ernannt. Am Konzil von Nizäa verteidigte er die "Einigkeit des Vaters und Sohnes" gegen das Ketzertum des Arias. Er wurde schon im Leibesleben durch seine Wundertaten berühmt[17].

Nikolaus von Pinara ar Bischof in der Stadt Pinara, durch die er seinen Beinahmen erhalten hat. Er lebte zur Zeit des Kaisers Justinianus (527-565) und soll Zeuge der Hungersnot in den Jahren 542-544 gewesen sein. Nach der Überlieferung soll er 480 geboren und 564 gestorben sein. Andere Überlieferungen dagegen geben sein Todesjahr mit 699 an[18]. Nikolaus von Pinara soll ebenfalls noch im Leibesleben Wundertaten vollbracht haben[19]. Er soll im Kloster von Sion begraben worden sein, wo er früher als Abt tätig gewesen war.

Der kirchenslavische Text über das Leben des heiligen Nikolaus, das sog. "Inoho žitija" unter dem Titel" (6(3) dekabrja. Žitie i dějanie iže vo svjatyx otca našeho Nikoly, arxiepiskopa myrlikijskaho, čudotvorca i zastupnika rodu xristijanskomu", der mit den Worten beginnt: "Vo dni prežnjaja blahovoli Boh vzyskati pisanija, eže ot drevnix prorok propovedannaja...", enstand (nach den Untersuchungen Arximandrit Leonids in der zweiten Hälfte des 19. Jahrhunderts) nach dem griechischen Urtext, den wir bei Carminius Falconius in seiner Buche *Sanci confessoris et celeberrimi thaumaturgi Nicolai acta primigenia* (Neapoli, 1751) vorfinden.[20] In den beiden Texten sind gewisse Widersprüche über die Persönlichkeiten der beiden gleichnamigen Bischöfe enthalten. Im griechischen Text ist die Rede davon, dass Nikolaus vom Erzbischof Philippos von Myra zum Bischof von Pinara ernannt wurde; im kir-

[16] F.A. Brockhaus, *Konversationslexikon*, II, (Leipzig, 1885), S. 243.

[17] Jacobus de Veragine, *Legenda Aurea* (s. Anm. 3), S. 110 und weiter.

[18] Johann Evang. Stadler (s. Anm. 2), S. 547.

[19] Karl Fissen (s. Anm. 1), S. 4.

[20] N. Nikol'skij (s. Anm. 9), S. 326. Auch M. Golubinskij in *Čtenija v Imperatorskom Obščestve i Drevnostej Rossijskix pri Moskovom Universitete*, 4 Buch, B. I, Kap. IV, S. 773.

chenslavischen dagegen, dass er vom Erzbischof Philipposs "Feletijskoj mitropoliji" (in anderen Handchriften auch "Tetalijskoj mitropoliji") zum Bischof von Myra bestimmt worden sei. Im griechischen Text heisst es, Nikolaus sei am Mittwoch den 6. Dezember im 13. Indiktionszykjlusjarh und im 18. Regierungsjahr des Kaisers Justinianus, unter dem Patriarchen Makarios (von Jerusalem) gestorben; nach der kirchenslavischen Übersetzung dagegen soll er am 6. Dezember der 4. Indiktionsperiode und im 28. Regierungsjahr des Kaisers Konstantins unter dem seeligen Patriarchen Makarios gestorben sein.

Die Anführung des Patriarchen Makarios löst den Widerspuch ebenfalls nicht, da es zwei Patriarchen Makarios von Jerusalem gegeben hat: einer davon lebte zur Zeit Kaiser Konstantins und bekleideite von 313 bis 331 oder 332 einen Bischofsposten, der zweite dagegen zur Zeit des Kaisers Justinianus und bekleidete zweimal einen Bischofsposten, von 546 bis 548 und von 563 bis 574[21].

Dieser Widerspruch ist darauf zurückzuführen, dass die beiden gleichnamigen Bischöfe aus ein und derselben Provinz stammten, dass beide einen Bischofsposten bekleidet hatten und beide durch ihre Wundertaten schon während ihres irdischen Lebens berühmt geworden waren. Die Ähnlickheit der Lebensumstände der beiden Bischöfe führte zu einer Verwechslung ihrer Person sowohl in den geschichtlichen als auch in den legendären Überlieferungen.

Der Nikolauskult hielt seinen Einzug in Kiev mit der Einführung des Christentums. Die Verehrung des Heiligen hatte schon früher in den liturgischen Texten der griechischen Kirche, in den Heiligenlegenden und Hymnen, die später ins Kirchenslavische übersetzt wurden, feste Gestalt angenommen.

Die Einführung des Christentums stellte einen Wendepunkt in der Geschichte der kulturellen Entwicklung der Ukraine dar. Sowohl der christliche Glaube im allgemeinen als auch der Nikolauskult fanden hier einen fruchtbaren Boden für ihre Verbreitung und Weiterentwicklung. In der Zeit der Übernahme des Kultes hatte die Verehung des heiligen Nikolaus in der griechischen Kirche bereits ihren Höhepunkt erreicht.

[21] M. Golubinskij (s. Anm. 20), S. 773.

Er wurde in einem alle anderen Heiligen, vielleicht die Gottesmutter ausgenommen, weit überragenden Masse verehrt. Daher nimmt es nicht wunder, wenn der Nikolauskult auch in der Ukraine bald festen Fuss fasste. Durch seine Wundertaten, seine Gerechtigkeit, Barmherfzigkeit und Liebe fand der Heilige weitgehende Aufnahme im Herzen des zum Christentum bekehrten Volkes. Später wurden die aus Griechenland stammenden legendären Überlieferungen von den Wundertaten des Heiligen durch auf ukrainischem Boden neu enstandene Legenden bereichert.

Die Verbreitung und Festigung des Nikolauskultes entfällt in erster Linie auf den Ausgang des 9. Jahrhunderts und das 10. and 11. Jahrhundert. Doch besass man in Kiev schon bedeutend früher geringe Kenntnisse über das Leben und die Wundertaten des Heiligen. Der Nikolauskult bildet ein untrennbares Glied des Glaubens an Gott und seine Heiligen und wurde als solches gleichzeitig mit dem Christentum in die Ukraine verpflanzt. Es ist jedoch trotzdem erforderlich, die Ursachen der Entstehund des Kultes genauer zu klären.

Diese Aufgabe wäre bedeutend erleichtert, wenn es in der ostslavischen Mythologie eine Gottheit gäbe, die sich mit der Gestalt des heiligen Nikolaus vergleichen liesse oder wenigstens ännliche Züge aufweisen würde. Durch Auffindung einer dem Heiligen entsprechenden Gestalt in der heidnischen Mythologie liessen sich die Ursachen der Verbreitung des Nikolauskultes in nachweislich früher Zeit und für seine aussergewöhnlich rasche Entfaltung leichter bestimmen.

Veselovskij sagt hierzu: "Die alten Götter waren nicht immer im halbheidnischen Gedächtnis des Mittelalterlichen Christen verschlossen, sie verbargen sich lediglich unter dem Namen neuer Heiliger, wobei ihre Macht und ihre Züge erhalten blieben"[22]. Darnach wären die meisten christlichen Heiligen die gleichen alten heidnischen Götter, die nur das Kleid und den Namen gewechselt hätten. Wenn also nach dieser Behauptung die Mehrheit der Heiligen inhaltlich den heidnischen Gött-

[22] Zitiert nach Aničkov, A.K. Borozdin, Ovsjaniko-Kulikovskij, *Istorija russkoj literatury*, B.I. (Moskau, 1908), S. 42.

ern entspräche, so müssten vor allem die wichtigsten von ihnen, darunter auch der heilige Nikolaus ihren Prototyp unter diesen Göttern haben. Diese Erklärung hält jedoch der Kritik nicht stand, da sie nicht in der Lage ist, zur Beweisführung konkrete Tatsachen anzugeben.

Unsere Vofahren hingen wohl noch lange Zeit nach der Einführung des Christentums am altheidnischen Götterglauben, an heidnischen Sitten und Gebräuchen, obwohl sie sich äusserlich zum Christentum bekannt hatten. Man hatte wohl auf Befehl von oben, vom Staate, die Götzenbilder Peruns, Dažbohs, Stribohs usw. vernichtet, sie aus den Augen des Volkes entfernt, damit sie rascher in Vergessenheit gerieten. Trotzdem aber lebte der alte Glaube, unter dem Einfluss der neuen christlichen Lehre verblasst, besonders in den entlegenen Orten noch lange Zeit weiter.

Es ist auch verständlich, das diejenigen Züge der neuren Lehre, die an ähnliche Erscheinungen in den altheidnischen Brauchen erinnerten einen viel fruchtbaren Boden und raschere und weitere Ausbreitung hätten finden müssen. Es hätte hier lediglich sozusagen ein Personenwechsel stattgefunden. Die Rechte und die Zuständigkeit dagegen hätten sich nicht geändert, sie wären nur von den Erbvätern auf die Erbenkel übergegangen. Es hätte sich also bloss die äusere Form geändert, der Inhalt jedoch wäre derselbe geblieben. Wenn sich daher unter den ostslavischen altheidnischen Göttern eine Gottheit befände, deren Züge mit der Gestalt des heiligen Nikolaus identisch wären, so liesse sich die rasche Verbreitung des Nikolauskultes einfach erkären und der hervorragende Platz des heiligen Nikolaus unter allen übrigen Heiligen wäre leicht zu rechtfertigen. Doch gibt es keinerlei Anhaltspunkte für die Rechtfertigund einer solchen Annahme. In der ostslavischen Mythologie gab es keine einzige Gottheit, die als Wundertäter und Gabenspender bekannt gewesen wäre. Den Gedanken, dass die Gestalt des heiligen Nikolaus in Verbindung zu einer heidnischen Gottheit stehe, brachte zum erstenmal Jakob Grimm zum Ausdruck. Er sagt: "Ich kann mir wohl denken, dass schon im Heidentum der Gottheit, deren Erscheinung Glučk und Heil verkündigte, ein lustiger Alb oder Zwerg als Diener zur seite stand und ihre Segnungen dem gemeinen Haufen versinnlichte. In christlichen Zeit mochte zuerst dem Christkind oder der Mutter Gottes, bei ihrer

Gabenspende, einen Heiligen zugesellen, der aber unvermerkt wieder in den alten Kobold und in einen vergröberten ausartete."[23].

Grimms Nachfolger gingen bedentend weiter, sie griffen seine Vermutung auf und stellten diese als feststehende Tatsache hin. Johann Wilhelm Wolf nenn Wotan, Donar und Froh als diejenigen germanischen Götter, von welchen Züge auf Nikolaus übergegangen seinen. Karl Wienhold sagt: ".....Im allgemeinen ist Wuotan, Ruprecht, dem heiligen Nikolaus oder Joseph oder auch dem heiligen Petrus gewichen; die Göttin ward durch die heilige Maria, auch wohl durch das Christkind und den Engel verdrängt"[24].

Die gleiche Auffassung vertraten später eine ganze Reihe deutscher Forscher, wie Karl Simrock und Wilhelm Mannhard[25]. Letzterer sieht in Ruprecht den ruhmstrahlenden Gott Wodan selbst", dem auch "St. Nikolaus, der kinderfreundliche Bischof von Myra..... seinen Namen hat leihen müssen"[26].

Ignaz von Zingerle versucht die Gestalt des heiligen Nikolaus aus dem Wassermann (Nichus, Nixor, Nix usw.) herzuleiten, die ins Christliche übersetzt in Nikolaus weiterleben soll. Alexander Tille nimmt an, dass die Germanen im Herbste zwei Schlachtzeiten hatten, die eine Anfang November und andere Anfang Dezember. Vielleicht schon vor Einführung des Christentums in Deutschland seien diese beiden Schlachtzeiten als Festzeiten festgelegt worden, deren beide Hochtage dann nach Einführung des Christentums den Namen Martinag und Nikolaustag erhalten hätten[27]. Der 11. November und 6. Dezember hätten diesen Namen dann beibehalten.

Die meisten Forscher auf dem Gebiet der germanischen Mythologie versuchen die Gestalt des heiligen Nikolaus mit. dem germanischen Wasssergot in Einklang zu bringen. Sie schreiben die Züge des genannten Gottes häufig Ruprecht zu und verbinden letzteren mit der Gestalt des heiligen Nikolaus.

[23] Jakob Grimm, *Deutsche Mythologie,* 1 Aufl. (Göttingen, 1835), S. 294.
[24] Zitiert nach Karl Meisen (s. Anm. 4), S. 3.
[25] *Handbuch der deutschen Mythologie,* 6 aufl. (Bonn, 1887), S. 549.
[26] Zitiert nach Karl Meisen (s. Anm. 4), S. 4.
[27] Ibidem, S. 4.

Den Deutschen folgten slavische Forscher in Bulgarien, Russland und in der Ukraine. Sie befassten sich jedoch nicht so eingehend mit der Frage über die Einstehung des Nikolauskultes aus der heidnischen Mythologie, wie dieses bei den deutschen Forschern der Fall war. Aus den allgemeinen Ergebnissen dieser Forschungen lassen sich jedoch einzelne Schlussfolgerungen über die Herkunft des Nikolauskultes ziehen.

In den Mitteilungen über Glaube und Sitten des bulgarischen Volkes kommt der Gedanke zum Ausdruck, dass die Züge des heiligen Nikolaus Überreste aus der heidnischen Zeit aufweisen: "Na sv. Nikola se pripisvat' vsičkitě atributi na jazičeskogo božestvo na moretata i povečeto običai i vervanija nego den' sǫ tože ostatъci otъ onova vreme"[28].

Die Frage über die Entstehung der Heiligenverehrund lässt sich nicht durch Anwendung der vergleichenden Methode Benfejs und Stasovs[29], nicht durch die Methode Veselovskijs[30] oder ihnen ähnliche Hypothesen, auch nicht durch die sog. Volksmagie Frasers[31] mit positivem Erfolge lösen. Auch die Annahme ist nicht stichhaltig, dass die Gestalt des heiligen Nikolaus ihren Ursprung in der heidnischen Mytholigie des Orients habe, von dort nach Griechenland gekommen und hier mit den Zügen des Christlichen Heiligen ausgestattet worden sei; von wo der Kult des Heiligen schon seinen Weg in die Ukraine gefunden habe und an die nationale Eigenhart der Ukrainer angepasst worden sei. Der Nikolauskult hat seinen Ursprung im christianisiertien Griechenland, er kam von dort teils direkt, teils über Bulgarien in die Ukraine, wo er durch neue einheimische und abendländische Legenden und Apokryphen bereichert wurde. Der Nikolauskult enstand nicht auf heidnischem Boden, sondern ist seinem Wesen nach eine Schöpfung der wunderbedürftigen Frühzeit des Christentums.

Im Orient gibt es keine dem heiligen Nikolaus ähnliche Gestalt unter den nichtchristlichen Gottheiten; dasselbe trifft auch auf die ostslavische heidnische Mythologie zu. Da der Nikolauskult im gesamten

[28] R. Slavejkov, *Bъlgarski narodni običai verovanija,* 1924, S. 146.

[29] E.A. Aničkov u.a. (s. Anm. 22), S. 35, 37.

[30] Das Christentum habe nur durch die Namengebung Anteil, während Inhalt und Komposition dem Heidentum entnommen seinen.

[31] Zitiert nach Aničkov (s. Anm. 22), S. 62.

Abendlande verbreteit ist, so müsste es daher auch in anderen abenländischen Mytholigien einen Prototyp des hl. Nikolaus geben. Doch in keiner dieser Mythologien finden wir eine Gestalt, welche die Hauptzüge des hl. Nikolaus verkörpern würde.

Wenn es richtig wäre, dass der Nikolauskult aus der heidnischen Mythologie entstanden sei, so müsste er sich bei diesen Völkern schon sehr früh, auf jeden Fall sofort mit der Einführung des Christentums entwickelt haben[32]. Wir sehen jedoch, dass beispielweise in Oberdeutschland das Christentum um die Mitte des 8. Jahrhunderts, in Norddeutschland Anfang des 9. Jahrhunderts angenommen wurde, der Nikolauskult aber erst im ausgehenden 10. und beginnenden 11. Jahrhundert seinen Eingang fand, Dieselbe Erscheinung finden wir auch in Frankreich, in den Niederlanden und anderen Ländern Westeuropas vor. Mit Ausnahme Italiens, wo der Brauch schon im 9. Jahrhundert verbreitet war, taucht der Nikolauskult überall im Abendlande zeitlich erst lange der Einführung des Christentums auf.

Der heidnische Glaube unserer Vorfahren beschränkte such nicht auf den Hauptgott Perun und die ihm unterstellten Gottheiten Veles, Dažboh, Xors, Striboh and Svorožiz. Neben diesen Gottheiten gab es noch eine bunte Menge von niederen Geistern, die ihren Sitz in Bäumen, Quellen, Pflanzen, Sümpfen, Seen usw. hatten. Der Geisterglaube fand seinen Ausdruck in Sagen und Märchen, von denen Furcht und Schrecken ausgingen und das Volk zum Gebet und zur Opferdarbringung veranlassten. Das einfache Volk suchte im Alltagsleben Schutz bei den Hausgeistern. Daher taucht die Frague auf, ob nicht einzelne Wesenzüge dieses Geisterbrauches in der späteren Heiligenverehrung, insbesondere im Nikolauskult ihren Ausdruck fanden. Bei einer genauen Untersuchung der Frage müssen wir jedoch zur Sclussfolgerung gelangen, dass der Animismus keine wesentlichen Züge im christlichen Heiligenkult hinterlassen hat. Der hl. Nikolaus besitzt keine der Eigenschaften der Wald-, Wasser-, Berg-, Pflanzen- und Sumpfgeister; diese

[32] Die Forscher germanischen Mythologie stellten selbst fest: "Nur die in den ersten Jahrunderten von den Bekehrern mitgebrachten Heiligen können an die Stelle der alten Götter getreten seinen" (nach Karl Meisen, S. 3 und weiter).

wieder umgekehrt nicht die Eigenschaft, Wundertaten zu vollbringen. Die christliche Kirche verfolgte weiter den Zweck, den heidnischen Glauben mit Hilfe des Staates auszurotten. Nicht nur die heidnischen Gottheiten, sondern alles was mit dem Heidentum in Verbindung stand, wie Götzen, Denkmäler der Volkskunst aus heidnischer Zeit, heidnisches Volksbrauchtum wurden vernichtet. Dazu sagt A.N. Pypin: "Pervym delom knjazja Vladimira bylo nizverženie idolov: tak bylo sdelano v Kieve; potom v Novgorode. Pervye učiteli christianstva ne udovol'stvovalis' etim uničtoženiem predmetov jazyčeskogo kulta i propoveduja novoe učenie, otvergli celikom ves' staryj obyčaj, v kotorom videli predanie jazyčestva"[33].

Die Kirchenvorschriften des Fürsten Vladirmirs verbieten zu beten "pod ovinom ili v roščenji, ili u vody"[34] Allerdings der Götzen- und Geisterglaube lebte im Volke noch lange nach der Einführung des Christentums fort. Besonders verbretiet war der Aberglaube unter der von den Kulturzentren weit entfernten bäerlichen Bevölkerung. Sogar im 16. Jahrhundert hatte man die Überreste des alten Glaubens noch nicht völlig überwunden.

Die einzelne Überreste des heidnischen Götterglaubens haben unter dem einVolke der Ukraine noch lange Zeit nach der Annahme des Christentums weitergelebt. Dieser Glaube galt nicht mehr bestimmten heidnischen Gottheiten, da letztere unter dem Glanze des stärkeren christlichen Glaubens bereits verblasst waren. Die Kirche verhielt sich zu diesen Überresten aber nicht gleichgültig, sondern bekämpfte und vernichtete sie als etwas Böses, als des "Teufels Werk". Hätte die christliche Kirche einen Teil der heidnischen Bräuche übernommen, so wäre es ihr unmöglich gewesen, den restlichen Teil als des "Teufelswerk" zu stempeln und auszurotten. Der Kult wird vom Glauben geboren. Das Wesen des christichen Glaubens war von dem des heidnischen völlig verschieden, daher war auch der kultische Branch als äusserliche Form desselben verschieden. Wäre also der Nikolausbrauch einfach eine eidnische Überlieferung, so würde dieses nicht der Aufmerksamskeit der

[33] Zitiert nach Aničkov (s. Anm. 22), S. 16.
[34] Ibidem, S. 55.

Kirche entgangen sein. Der Nikolauskult wäre vernichtet worden und hätte keinen Platz in der christlichen Staatsreligion gefunden.

Die Tatsache jedoch, dass der Nikolauskult ebenso wie die Verehrung eines jeden anderen Heiligen von der Kirche selbst verbreitet und gepriesen wurde, ist der beste Beweis dafür, dass seine Verehrung keine wesentlichen Züge der heidnischen Mythologie enthält und ausschliesslich auf christlichem Boden entstanden ist. In seiner Weiterentwicklung auf ukrainischem Boden nahm er ausser seinen ursprünglichen orientalischen Zügen neue aus dem Abendlande und in der Ukraine selbst enstandene an.

Es bliebe jetzt nur noch die Frage zu klären, was die Ursache war, dass gerade der heilige Nikolaus unter dem Volke am beliebsten wurde.

Aničkov vertritt gleich Tille die Ansicht, dass die Gestalten der Heiligen eine Versinnbildlichung der vorchristlichen Volksfeiretage darstellen. Die Volksfeiertage bildeten, zeitlich gesehen, den Volksalender. Durch die Vermittlung des Kalendars, der ein Erbe griechisch-römischer Kultur darstellt, gelangten reinchristlichen Gestalten zur Kenntnis des Volkes. Der Volkskalander macht uns mit einer Reihe derartiger Gestalten bekannt, wie z.B. Karačun, Koljada, Ovsen', Osen' oder Avsen', baba Korizna, Morena, Kostroma, Kostrubon'ko, Rusal'ji und Rusalka, Semik und Jarylo. Neben diesen volstümlichen Namen, sagt Aničkov, sind auch die christlichen zu nennen: Trojca, Bogorodica, sv. Jurij oder Georgij, sv. Nikolaj, Ilij prorok und Joan Chrestitel' (im Volksmund Ivan Kupala)[35]. Und weiter heisst es bei Aničkov: "Sblizivšiesja s narodnoju obrjadnost'ju prazdniki byli olicetvoreny i togda voznikli lica, ničego obščego s žyznennymi voobraženijami ne imejuščie, obrazy svjatyx".

Der Gedanke Aničkovs, dass die christlichen Heiligen eine Versinnbildlichung der Volksfeste darstellen, trägt jedoch einen zu allgemeinen Charakter. Es mag wohl der Wahrheit entsprechen, dass die heidnischen Vorfahren des ukrainischen Volkes in veschiedenen Jahreszeiten Volksfeiern begingen, die mit diesen Jahreszeiten inhaltich eng verbunden waren. So wurde das Winterfest Koljada, ein Fest Frühlings, das Som-

[35] Ibidem, S. 74.

merfest Kupala und das Herbstfest Osen' oder Usen' alljährlich gefeiert, doch waren Inhalt und Ritual dieser Feste von den christlichen völlig verschieden. Die Annahme, dass die christlichen Heiligen mit den Volksfeiertagen identisch seien, entbehrt also jeder nachweisbaren Grundlage. Ebenso lässt sich nicht nachweisen, dass die die Volksfeiertage versinnbildlichenden Gestalten, d.h. die christlichen Heiligen, den früheren heidnischen Bräuchen angepasst wurden. Es sind wohl einzelne Volksbräuche aus diesen Feiertagen, wie die Verbrennung des "didux" in Morgengrauen des zweiten Weihnachtstages als Rest des Festes der Wintersonnenwende oder Koljada oder die Entfachung eines Feuers in der Osternacht als Rest des Frühlingsfestes erhalten geblieben. Diese Bräuche werden jedoch nur vom Volke oder besser gesagt nur von den Dorfburschen gepflegt, sie haben dagegen keinen Platz in der Kirche und in den kirchlichen Schriften und werden vom Volke als nebensächlicher, jeglichen Inhalt entberender angesehen.

Es taucht nun noch eine Frage auf. Welches heidnische Volksfest würde gegebenefals durch die Gestalt des heiligen Nikolaus versinnbildlicht worden sein? Nicht für jeden Heiligentag lässt sich ein zeitlich entsprechendes Volksfest bestimmen. Es lässt sich beispielweise kein dem 6. Dezember, dem Nikolaustag (prazdnyk zymnoho Mykoly) entsprechender heidnischer Volksfeiertag nachweisen. Dieser Feiertag wurde aus Griechenland übernommen und entspricht zeitlich dem Todestag des Heiligen Der 9. Mai, der Tag der Überführung der Gebeine des Heiligen (praznyk teploho Mykoly) dagegen stimmt aller Wahrscheinlichkeit nach in der Zeit mit einem heidnischen Volksfest überein und versinnbildlicht dieses Fest.

In einer Lebensbeschreibung des heiligen Nikolaus heisst es "Russalija sv. Nikolaja"[36]. "Russalija" hiess ein bäuerliches Frühlingsfest in heidnischer Zeit. Das Russalienfest wurde also mit dem Namen des Heiligen in Verbindung gebracht. Wahrscheinlich sah man gerade diese Verbindung als die Versinnbildlichung des heidnischen Volksfestes durch den christlichen Heiligen an. Aničkov ist der Meinung, dass der Nikolaustag am 9. Mai in Griechenland schon lange vor der im 11: Jahrun-

[36] Ibidem, S. 15.

dert stattgefundenen Überführung der Gebeine des Heiligen verbreitet war, und von dort in die Ukraine verpflantzt wurde. In Griechenland kennt man jedoch heute diesen Feiertag nicht. Nach Teofil Kostruba wurzelt dieses Fest ideologisch im Abenlande[37]. N. Baumgarten bezeichnet den Früjahrs-Nikolaustag als nicht griechisches Fest[38]. Die Versinnbildlichung muss also auf ukrainischem Boden stattgefunden haben. Formell wurde dieses Fest mit der Überführung der sterblichen Überreste des Heiligen nach Bari verknüpft, obwohl es zeitlich schon viel früher bekannt war. Die Heiligenverehrung ist sogar schon vor der Einführung des Christentums im Kiever Staate bekannt gewesen. Das Stratelatewunder oder die Erretnung der drei tapferen Männer vom Tode durch den heiligen Nikolaus, wie auch andere Wundertaten des Heiligen, stärkten den Glauben an den wahren Christengott. Es ist daher leicht verständlich, dass man sich in allen Nöten um Beistand an Gott über Vermittlung des Heiligen wandte. Besonders mag dieses jedoch in solchen Angelegenheiten der Fall gewesen sein, die alle Bevölkerungsschichten und Alterklassen angingen. Eine solche Angelegenheit bildete in der Ukraine die Landwirtschaft[39]. Von einer guten oder schlechten Ernte hing der Lebensunterhalt nicht nur der bäuerlichen, sondern auch der städtischen Bevölkerung ab[40]. Die Hilfe in dieser Frage ging daher die Allgemeinheit an. Man erwartate sie daher von dem Helfer aus allen Nöten, dem gütigen Wundertäter, dem heiligen Nikolaus. Er war für das Volk keine abstrakte, erdachte Gestalt, sondern eine Persönlichkeit, die wirklich gelebt hatte, die noch im Leibesleben durch ihre Wundertaten berühmt geworden und von Gott zum Heiligen erwähnt worden war.

Die Allgemeine Vorstellung des Volkes über Heiligen stammut aus Griechenland. Der Glaube an seine Hilfe aus allen Nöten veranlasste daher das Volk, die Zuständigkeit des Heiligen auch auf die Landwirt-

[37] Teofil' Kostruba, *Vira našyx predkiv* (Lviv, 1941), S. 20.

[38] N. Baumgarten, "Sv. Volodymyr i xreščennja Rusy" in *Bohoslovija*, B. IX, 1-Buch (Lviv, 1931), S. 132.

[39] Die Ukrainer sind ein vorwiegend Ackerbau treibendes Volk gevesen.

[40] In dieser Zeit war das Handwerk auch noch in den Städten schwach entwickelt.

schaft, besonders auf die Ernte auszudehnen. Der heilige Nikolaus verhalf denjenigen, die ihn darum baten, zu einer guten Ernte. Diese Tätigkeit des Heiligen kommt in folgenden Worten eines weissruthenischen Volksliedes zum Ausdruck:

> Svjataja Mikola, staraja osoba,
> Nema joho vdoma, pišov u polje,
> Po mežam xodit', žyto rodit'[41]

In einer Koljada heisst es:

> S'vityj Nykola
> Za pluhom xodyt'[42]

Diese ursprüngliche Bedeutung der Gestalt des heiligen Nikolaus in der Ukraine, die auf Grund der "Versinnbildlichung" entstanden ist und als Ursache der Ausbreitung des Nikolausbrauches gedient haben mochte, fand lange vor der Überführung der sterblichen Überreste des Heiligen aus Myra in Lykien nach Bari ihren Eingang. Die kirchliche Literatur legte das Schwergewicht gerade auf diese Überführung der sterblichen Überreste und die damit im Zusammenhang stehenden Wundertaten des Heiligen. Die ursprüngliche Bedeutung des Nikolauskultes wurde in den Hintergrund gedrängt, teils auf den hl. Georg, teils auf den Propheten Elias übertragen. Letzteres wird von der Tatsache bestätigt, dass die ursprüngliche Funktion des Heiligen, das Gedeihen des Getreides, die unter dem Volke spontan sich verbreitet hatte, in der liturgischen Texten und in der kirchlichen Literatur nirgends erwähnt wird. Dieses lässt sich damit erklären, dass die ersten Kirchenschriften Übersetzungen griechischer Originaltexte oder Nachahmungen letzterer waren. Da in den Originaltexten die Zustañdigkeit des hl. Nikolaus für das Wachstum und Gedeihen des Getreides nicht erwähnt wurde, so finden wir darüber auch kein Wort in den Übersetzungen und dieses sowohl in den Texten zum 6. Dezember, als auch zum 9. Mai. Diese Tatsache versucht man noch darauf zurückzuführen, dass die den Liturgien eigenschaltete Verherrlichung der Überführung der sterblichen

[41] Aničkov (s. Anm. 22), S. 75.
[42] Filjaret Kolessa, *Ohljad ukrajins'ko-rus'koji poeziji* (Lviv, 1905), S. 17-18.

Überreste des Heiligen ausschlüsslich abendländischen Ursprungs sei. Im Abendlande war der Heilige aber nie als Schutzpatron für das Gedeihen des Getreides zuständig.

Aus dis bisher Gesagten gelangen wir zur Schlussfolgerung, dass aller Wahrscheinlichkeit nach der Nikolauskult auf ukrainischem Boden żuerst unter dem Volke und unter dem Kaufleuten und Recken (družynnyky) und zwar lange vor der formellen Annahme durch die Kirche verbreitet war. Nach der Einführung des Christentums erhielt der hl. Nikolaus, auf Grund der kirchenslavischen Übersetzungen der Literatur über das Leben und die Wundertaten des Heiligen, völlig neue Züge. In der Ukraine war der Weg der ursprünglichen Verehrung des Heiligen ein anderer als in Griechenland und im Abendlande. In Griechenland enstand die Verehrung des Heiligen zuerst in den Kirchen, Klöstern und unter der Geistlichkeit, wo der Glaube besonders gepflegt wurde; erst später dagegen fand die Verehrung auch unter den breiten Volksmassen Verbreitung. Eine ähnliche Erscheinung kann man auch im Abendland feststellen. Nach der Überführung der sterblichen Überreste aus Myra nach Bari findet der Nikolauskult seine Verbreitung in den Kirchen und Klöstern und in den oberen Bevölkerungsschichten, dagegen erst später unter dem einfachen Volke. Nur zufällig erscheint in den Quellen die Erwähnung des Nikolauskultes bei den Einwohnern einer Ortschaft in dieser Zeit[43]. Der Nikolauskult nahm seinen Ausgang aus Bari und wurde vom Klerus in damaligen deutsch-römischen Reiche und anderen Ländern Westeuropas verbreitet. Das Volk hatte keinen Anteil an der ursprünglichen Entiwicklung des Nikolauskultes. Die Verehrung des Heiligen hatte also in der Ukraine eine andere Grundlage als in Griechenland und im Abendlande; sie hatte ihre ersten Vertreter in einzelnen weltlichen Persönlichkeiten. Selbstverstäandlich trug diese Verehrung primitiven Charakter, beschränkte sich auf die spärliche Kenntnis ein-

[43] *Fontes rerum Bermensium*, I (Bern, 1879), S. 366: In einem Dokument, in dem Graf Wilhelm von Ogo im Jahre 1073 die St. Nikolauskirche in Rougement (Diözese Lausanne) dem Kloster Clun schenkt, wird zur Bestätigung der Schenkungsurkunde hinzufügt "ab incolis eiusdem loci digna celebratur memoria" (d.h. des hl. Nikolaus, W.J.). Zitiert nach Karl Meisen....(s. Anm. 4), S. 93.

zelner Wundertaten des Heiligen, doch hatte sie nichtsdestoweniger bereits den Glauben gebören. Obwohl dieser Glaube noch schwach war und sich noch nicht vom Banne heidnischer Gottheiten und Brauchtumes freigemacht hatte, so bildete er trotzdem die Grundlage für das spätere Wirken der Kirche. Nach der offiziellen Gründung der Kirche wurde die Verehrung des Heiligen durch neue Legenden aus Griechenland, durch Apokryphen aus Bulgaria und später auch durch Legenden aus dem Abendlande bereichert. Auf ukrainischem Boden enstandem neue Legenden, Fabel, Märchen usw., die der Heiligengestalt ihren für die Ukraine eigentümlichen Charakter gaben. Der Nikolauskult hatte und hat daher in der Ukraine breitere Anwendung und grössere Bedeutung als im Abendlane und in Griechenland selbst, von wo er seinen Ursprung genommen hat.

Nachträgliche Werke

Falconius, N.C., ed., *Sancti confessoris pontificis et celeberrimi thaumaturgi Nicolai acta primigenia* (Naples, 1751).

Hruševs'kyj, Myxajlo, *Istorija ukrijins'koji literatury* (New York, 1959), I, S. 124, 145, 147; II, S. 38, 46, 92-96, 183; IV, S. 157-8, 382-3, 530-1, 552-3, 608-10.

Čubatyj, Mykola, *Istorija xrystyjanstva na Ukrajini* (Rom-New York, 1965), S. 83, 415.

Leonid (Archimandrite), "Žitie i čudesa sv. Nikolaja Mirlikijskago i poxvala emu. Issledovanie dvux pamjatnikov pis'mennosti XI veka." *Pamjatniki drevnej pis'mennosti i iskusstva* (S.-Petersburg, 1881).

Lužnycky, Hryhor, *Ukrajins'ka cerkva miž Sxodom i Zaxodom* (Philadelphia), S. 83-84.

Nahajevs'kyj, Isydor, *Istorija ryms'kyx vselens'kyx arxyjerejiv* (München, 1964), S. 63, 255.

Tomašivs'kyj, Stepan, *Istorija cerkvy na Ukrajini,* S. 141-2.

Voznjak, Myxajlo, *Istorija ukrajins'koji literatury* (Lviv, 1924), S. 319-20.

Der Einfluß des Abendlandes auf die Gestaltung des heiligen Nikolàus in der Ukraine

Die Gestalt des hl. Nikolaus in der Ukraine ist hauptsächlich in den Legenden urkainischen und griechischen Ursprugs gefunden,[1] doch in seiner Bildung kann man auch etwas von abendländischen Merkmalen finden. Die die Ukraine rege Handelsbeziehungen mit dem Westen unterhielt, so ist es vertändlich, da*ß* auch die abendländische Kultur einen Einfluß auf die Ukraine ausübten. Irgendein ein Einfluß fand auch in der Heiligenverehrung, zum Beispiel im Kulte des hl. Nikolaus.

Auf dem großen Handelsweg zwischen Ostsee und Schwarzem Meer kamen in die Ukraine schwedische, deutsche, holländische, polnische und ungarische Kaufleute; dagegen benützen die Italiener den Seeweg über Konstantinopel und das Schwarze Meer oder sie kamen von der unteren Donau am Dnieper aufwärts nach Kiev. Die Städte Novgorod und Kiev bildeten die Handelszentren an diesen Straßen. In Kiev lebten Kaufleute aus Regensburg, Ems und Wien.[2] Aus dem Jahre

(In diesem Artikel ist die Transkription der Kongress Bibliotek für die slavishen Worte gebruacht.)

[1] Wasyl Jaszczun, "Aus dem Nikolauskulte in der volkloristischen und religiösen Literatur in der Ukraine", *Literaturni protsesy pislia druhoi svitovoi viiny* (Philadelphia-New York: Zapysky Naukovoho Tovarystva im. Shevchenka, t. 195, 1982), pp. 191-200.

[2] S. Solovev, *Istoriia Rossii s drevneishikh vremen* (Moskau, 1970), B. III, 4 Auflage, S. 47. M. Holubins'kyi, *Chteniia v imperatorskom obshchestve istorii i drevnostei rossiiskikh pri Moskovskom universitete* (Moskau, 1901), 4 Buch, B.I. Kap, III, S. 773.

1195 ist ein Handelsvertrag Novgorods unter Jaroslav mit deutschen und holländischen Kaufleuten erhalten geblieben. Die deutschen Kaufleute legten die Reise entweder auf Schiffen über die Ostsee oder in Karawanen über das Festland zurück. In einer Chronik aus dem Jahre 1201 ist gesagt, daß die Varjäger auch über die Berge (d.h. auf festen Straßen) kamen[3]. Durch die Handelsbeziehungen drang auch der Einfluß auf dem Gebiet der Kultur und Religion nach dem Osten. Die Kaufleute kamen häufig in Begleitung von Geistlichen, die den schriftlichen Verkehr in den Handelsgelegenheiten inne hatten[4]. So hielten sich beispielsweise in Novgorod katholische Geistliche gewöhnlich im Sommer auf. Sie kamen mit den Kaufleuten und kehrten auf den Winter in ihre Heimat zurück. Diese Geistlichen wurden von der Hansa bezahlt[5]. In Novgorod gab es auch eine katholische Kirche, die St. Petruskirche. Besonders rege Beziehungen unterhielt Novgorod mit Deutschland, wobei diese sich nicht nur auf den Handelsverkehr allein beschrankten, sondern auch auf dem Gebiet der Kultur und Religion zum Ausdruck kamen. Aus Deutschland drang eine verstärkte Propaganda der katholischen Kirche in die Ukraine. Einige Forscher zählen als Zeitpunkt der ersten Versuche, den Katholizismus in der Ukraine zu verbreiten, die Regierungszeit des Fürsten Volodymyr, wobei dieselben sich auf Titmar berufen. Titmar sagt: "Der Rus'-König Volodymyr hatte drei Söhne und einem von ihnem nahm er die Tochter des polnischen Königs und unseres Feindes (gemeint der Deutschen) Boleslav zur Frau, die von Reinbern, dem "presul Salvae Cholbergensis" begleitet wurde. Es fehlen mir die Worte und das Talent dazu, um ein Beschreibung davon zu geben, wieviel Mühe letzterer sich in der ihm anvertrauten Angelegenheit gab (in cura sibi commissa). Er vernichtete die Götzen und warf sie in einen See, der als Dämonensitz verehrt worden war, und reinigte letzteren mit Weihwasser; er gewann dem allmächtigen Gott einen neuen

[3] S. Solovev, S. 45.

[4] Mykola Chubatyi, *Zapysky Naukovoho Tovarystva im. Shevchenka* (Lviv), B. 123-124, S.6.

[5] Die "Hansa" wurde im 13. Jahrhundert gegründet (nach M. Pogodin, *Ijsledovaniia, zamechaniia i lektsii o russkoi istorii* (Moskau, 1846), B.I, S. 151.

Zweig eines unfruchtbaren Baumes, d.h. er impfte dem Volke auf die gröbste Art und Weide die heilige Lehre ein"[6].

In dieser Zeit war der Nikolauskult unter der Geistlichkeit und dem Rittertum des Herrscherhauses in Deutschland schon bekannt. Kaiser Otto II war mit der byzantinischen Prinzessin Theophanie vermählt, die am Kaiserhof nicht nur starken Einfluß auf die Politic ausübte, sondern sich auch in religiösen Angelegenheiten nicht gleichgültig verhielt. Ihr Sohn, Otto III, führte an seinem Hofe byzantinische Sittenein und gab dem von ihm erbauten Kloster Burtscheid in der Nähe von Aachen den Namen St. Nikolaus[7]. Wenn wir also in Betracht ziehen, welch besonderen Platz die Verehrung des heiligen Nikolaus in dieser Zeit in der griechischen Kirche inne hatte, so ist wohl anzunehem, daß der Nikolauskult auch in Deutschland einen fruchtbaren Boden vorgefunden haben mußte. Aller Wahrscheinlichkeit nach entstand der Nikolausbrauch auf deutschem Boden nicht nur unter dem Einfluß vom Süden aus Italien her, sondern auch durch unmittelbare Übernahme desselben aus Griechenland selbst. Da die Verehrung des Heiligen also in Deutschland bereits ihren Eingang gefunden hatte, so dürfte die Verbreitung des Nikolauskultes in der Missionstätigkeit deutscher katholischer Geistlicher in der Ukraine einen wichtigen Platz eingenommen haben.

Die Gestalt des heiligen Nikolaus dürfte gerade in den Predigten der Missionäre das beste Beispiel über die Gerechtigkeit und Allmacht des Christengottes erhalten haben.

Daß der religiose Einfluß des Abendlandes, insbesondere Deutschlands, besondere Bedeutung hatte, davon zeugt die Schrift Kiriks "Voproshanie", danach trugen die Frauen ihre Kinder zum Gebet zu den Priestern der Varjäger, anstatt sie zum Orthodoxen Geistlichen zu bringen[8]. Die Gläubigen sahen also keinen Unterschied zwischen orthodoxen und katholischen Geistlichen. Diese Erscheinung trat als Folge der

[6] M. Holubins'kyi, 3 Buch, S. 810.

[7] In Brunvilarensis monasterii fundatorum acta 10 wird als Ursache für die Wahl des heiligen Nikolaus als Schutzpatron angeführt, daß Otto III. mütterlicherseits Grieche gewesen sei (quod materno ex sanguine Graecus erat) in: Karl Meisen, *Nikolauskult und Nikolausbrauch im Abendlande* (Düsseldorf, 1931), S. 80, SS IV, S. 131.

[8] M. Holubins'kyi, 3 Buch, S. 811.

Missionstätigkeit katholischer Geistlicher ein, da sie als Stoff zu ihren Predigten in erster Linie die Heiligenlegenden verwendeten. Nun waren gerade die Wundertaten des heiligen Nikolaus sowohl in West — als auch in Osteuropa allgemein bekannt. Da im 11. und 12. Jahrhundert die Verbindung mit Byzanz durch die ständigen Eifälle der Nomadenvölker der Steppe immer mehr geschwächt wurde, wuchs der Einfluß des Abendlandes um so mehr. Im Abendlande erreichte der Nikolauskult in dieser Zeit gerade seine höchste Blüte. Er wurde durch neue Legenden, Hymnen und Dramen bereichert. Durch das Wirken des Dominikanerordens (fratres praedicatores) auf ukrainischem Boden, besonders in der Kirche Sancta Maria in Kiev zu Beginn des 13. Jahrhunderts, wurde das von den Missionären begonnen Werk fortgesetzt. Dieser Einfluß dauerte noch in späteren Jahrhunderten weiter fort. Einen wesentlichen Anteil am Erfolg der Missionstätigkeit hatte die Überführung der sterblichen Überreste des Heiligen nach Bari im Jahre 1087[9]. Dieses Ereignis bildete die Brücke zwishen em Abendlande und der Ukraine in der Verehrung des Heiligen. Das ukrainische Volk nahm dieses Ereignis mit Freuden auf und bestimmte den Tag der Überführung mit Genehmigung des Papstes Urbans II. zum allgemeinen Feiertag.

> Holubins'kyi bemüht sich in "Chteniia v imperatorskom obshchestve istorii i drevnostei rossiiskikh pri moskovskom universitete", die Kanonisation dieses Feirertages durch den Papst zu widerlegen. Er stellt fest, daß die katholischen Kirchenschriftsteller, die in der Tatsache, daß in der Ukraine ein Feiertag der Uberführung der sterblichen Überreste des heiligen Nikolaus besteht, die Anerkennung der Oberhoheit des Papstes durch die Ukrainer sehen, gegen sich selbst ein schwerwiegendes Argument hervorbringen. Holubins'kyi sagt: "In der Zeit, als bei uns der 9. Mai zum Feiertag erhoben wurde, soll sich der Papst an unseren Mitropoliten mit dem Vorschlag zur Gründung der kirchlichen Union gewendet haben worauf er jedoch eine ablehnende Antwort des Mitropoliten erhalten habe. Es ist klar, daß die Einführung des Feiertages nicht auf Anordnung des Papstes erfolgte, denn dann wäre dieser Feiertag in der gesamten katholischen Kirche eingeführt worden. Es wäre daher falsch anzunehmen, daß der Papst sich mit dem Gedanken getragen habe, diesen Feiertag nur in der

[9] Ibidem, S. 808.

rus'ian Kirche festzulegen. Vom Papst wurde dieser Tag als Fest-
tag nur für die Stadt Bari bestimmt." Holubins'kyi löst diese Frage jedoch nicht entgültig. Es taucht nämlich die Frage auf: Wer hat diesen Feiertag denn tatsächlich in der Ukraine eingeführt? Wenn es nicht der Papst war und nicht der Patriarch (denn in Griechenland kennt man diesen Feiertag überhaupt nicht), wer soll es denn geweson sein?
In vorliegenden Falle ist wohl folgende Erklärung annehmbar: Eine jede Tatsache spricht mehr für sich selbst, als irgend eine unklare verwickelte Beweisführung. Tatsache ist, daß dieser Feiertag in der Ukraine besteht und in Griechenland nicht anerkannt wird. Da dieser Feiertag vom Patriarchen in Griechenland nicht anerkannt wurde, so konnte er von ihm auch nicht in der Ukraine oder in einem anderen Lande eingeführt worden sein. In der Behauptung, daß der Papst diesen Feiertag nicht habe anordnen können, da die kirckliche Union mit Rom durch den Mitropoliten von Kiev abgelehnt worden sei, muß jedoch auseinandergehalten werden: der Vorschlag zur Union ging erstens nicht vom rechtmäßigen Papst Georg VII, sondern vom Gegenpapst Klemens III aus, daher konnte sich der Mitropolit Johannes der Sache durch ein Antwortschreiben entledigen; zweitens konnte der Mitropolit die Unionsfrage als eine formale Angelegenheit betrachten und Papst Klemens III vorgeschlagen haben, dieselbe mit den Patriarchen in Konstantinopel selbst zu lösen. Die Einführung des Feiertages konnte jedoch nicht vom Papst angeordnet worden sein, da derselbe formal nicht als Oberhaupt der ukrainischer Kirche galt. Es handelt sich hier vielmehr um einen spontanen Willensausdruck des ukrainischen Volkes. Der Wunsh des Volkes war es, diesen feierlich zu begehen. Die Anregung zur Feier der Überführung der sterblichen Überreste des heiligen Nikolaus gab jedoch Papst Urban II. Dieser Feiertag bildet den Ausdruck der religiösen Ideologie ukrainischer Vorfahren, und zwar der katholischen Ideologie, die äusere Form ihrer inneren psychologischen Einstellung auf religiösem Gebiet.

Zur Verherrlichung des Ereignisses entstanden die beiden Schriften unter dem Namen "Pokhval'nie slova" und die Übersetzung der Lebensgeschichte und Wundertaten des Heiligen[10]. In dieser Zeit besuchte auch

[10] Johannes Archidiaconus Barensis (1088): "De Translatione Sancti Nicolai Episcopi", abgedruckt in Surius Laurentius, *Historiae seu Vita sanctorum,* Episcopi ex Myra

der Gesandte des Kiever Mitropoliten Johannes II. Papst Klemens III., der einen Brief des Mitropoliten zur Frage der kirchlichen Union überbrachte. Der Einfluß des Abendlandes konnte sowohl unmittelbar aus Italien, als auf Umwegen über Frankreich, Deutschland und Polen in die Ukraine gelangen.

Es gibt jedoch auch Hinweise darauf, daß nicht nur allein Deutschland seinen Einfluß auf religiösem Gebiet in der Ukraine ausübte, sondern auch umgekehert in mancher Hinsicht das religiöse Leben Deutschlands aus der Ukraine beeinflußt wurde.

Prof. Maxym Slavins'kyj führt in seinem in Rahmen des historischen Unterausschusses gehaltenen Vortrag "Ches'ka zvistka pro Kyjivs'ku emigratsiiu XIII v." ein Dokument aus dem 13. Jahrhundert an, das in der "Regestra diplomatica nec non epistolaria" (I. Teil, umfagt die Jahre 600-1235) von Karl Promir Erben im Jahre 1855 in Prag herausgegeben wurde[11]. Das Dokument stellt einen Brief eines Mönchs aus dem Dominikanerorden vom 18-25 Mai 1241 dar. In dem Brief ist die Rede von dem Einfall der Tataren in "Russiam", von der Eroberung der Stadt "Kionam (Kiev) civitatem et castrum, quod erat ibi", Zum Unterschied von allen anderen Briefen aus dieser Zeit beruft sich der Verfasser, um die Glaubwürdigkeit seiner Schilderungen zu beweisen, darauf, daß alles dieses "narraverunt nobis profugi de terra illa in Saxonia praecipue".

Slavins'kyi vergleicht dieses Dokument mit analogen Dokumenten aus jener Zeit und kommt zur Schußfolgerung, daß auch andere Verfasser die Ereignisse auf Grund der Schilderungen von Flichtlingen, doch ohne Quellenangaben beschrieben haben. Nach den Mitteilungen der Chronisten mußte die Zahl der Flüchtlinge ("profugi"), die entweder aus Kiev selbst kamen oder in unmittelbarer Verbindung mit Kiev gestanden hatten, sehr groß gewesen sein. Da die gebildeten Kreise der damaligen Zeit sich hauptsächlich aus der Geistlichkeit zusammenset-

Lyciae urbe ad Apuliae oppidum Barium vel Barum ab Johanne Archd. Barensi, iubente Ursone Barensi et Canus Archiepiscopo, cca annum 1088".

[11] Ukrains'kyi Naukovyi Zjizd u Prazi 3-7 zhovtina, 1926 r. *Zvidomlennia prezydii orhanizatsiinoi komisii Zjizdu* (Praha, 1928).

zen, so dürte letztere auch zahlreiche Vertreter unter den Flüchtlingen gehabt haben. Ob diese Emigranten ihre Wohnsitze ständig in Sachsen aufschlugen oder wieder teilweise in ihre Heimat zurückkehrten, darüber fehlen jegliche geschichtlichen Angaben. Diese Flüchtlinge waren, wie dieses stets bei Emigranten der Fall ist, dem Einfluß ihres neuen Aufenthalts unterwirfen und brachten diesen Einfluß bei einer eventuellen Rückkehr in ihre Heimat mit. Da die Geistlichkeit in erster Linie kirchliche Fragen, darunter auch der Heiligenkult, interessieren mußten, so ist es verständlich, daß sie die neu erworbenen Kenntnisse auf diesem Gebièt in ihre Heimat mitbrachte. Gleichzeitig dürften die Flüchtlinge wohl auch während ihres Aufenthaltes in Deutschland gewisse geringfüge Einwirkungen auf den Heiligenkult ausgeübt haben. Wenn eine solche gegenseitige Beeinflussung sich auch nicht durch konkrete geschichtliche Tatsachen nachweisen läßt, so gewinnt sie jedoch durch Anwendung der Methode einer mittelbaren Schlußfolgerung viel an Wahrscheinlichkeit. So konnten auch die Mönche des Dominikaneordens (fratres praedicatores), die sich bis 1233 in der Ukraine aufhielten, irgend welche Besonderheiten des Nikolauskultes nach Deutschland verpflanzen. Dasselbe gilt auch für die irländischen Mönche des Benediktinerordens, der sich bis 1241 in der Ukraine erhalten hatte.

Die Legende von der Auferweckung der getöteten Schüler

Diese im Abendlande entstandene und am weitesten verbreitete Legende ist auch in der Ukraine bekannt; in den griechischen Überlieferungen fehlt sie dagegen vollkommen.

Die älteste Überlieferung der Legende im Abendlande findet sich in dramatisierter Form in der Hildesheimer Handschrift des *Liber sancti Godehardi in Hild* (esheim), die jetzt im Britischem Museum in London aufbewahrt wird. Die Handschrift ist von Ernst Dümmler ins 12. Jahrhundert gesetzt worden.[12] Wir begegnen dieser Legende im gleichen Jahrhundert in der französischen Volkssprache auch bei Wace, nur ver-

[12] Karl Meisen, s. Anm. 7, S. 289.

treten die Stelle der drei Schüler drei Geistliche.[13] Eine zweite Legende findet sich ebenfalls bei Wace unter dem Titel "Die Ermordung eines Kaufmannes und seine Wiedererweckung durch den heiligen Nikolaus". Der Inhalt dieser Legende ähnelt der vorhergehenden, nur wird die Stelle der drei Geistlichen durch den Kaufmann vertreten.[14] In einem Cantus des Petrus de Medicis, der in einer Handschrift der Laurenziana in Florenz aus dem 13. Jahrhundert überliefert ist, wird das Schülerwunder mit der Jungfrauenlegende zusammen in einer Strophe besungen:

Suscitavit clericos
Occisos invidia
Quos occidit carnifex
Cum sua nequitia,
Tres puellas maritavit,
De peccatis observavit,
Paupertatem relaxavit.

Bemerkenswert ist für Italien, daß die Wundergeschichte hier im 12. und 13. Jahrhundert fehlt. In prosa wird die Legende, allerdings mit dem Unterschiede, daß statt von dreien nur von zwei Schüllern die Rede ist, in einer Predigt erzählt, die gewöhnlich, wenn auch zweifellos mit Unrecht, Bonaventura zugeschrieben wurde. Sie hat hier folgende Fassung:

> Nam duo scholares nobiles et divites, multumque secum auri deferentes, Athenas ad philosophandum pergentes, prius s. Nicolaum videre volentes, ut se eius orationibus commendarent, in civitatem, in qua degebat episcopus, advenerunt. Quos hospes tam divites cernens, maligno spiritu pulsatus eos occidit et more porcorum in frusta concidit et eorum carnes in vase salivit. Quod s. Nicolaus dum ab angelo cognovit, in domum hospitis mox accessit et quidquid faceret indicavit; eumque valde redarguit et tandem orando pueros suscitavit.[15]

[13] Karl Fissen, *Das Leben des heiligen Nikolaus in der altfranzösischen Literatur und seine Quellen* (Göttingen, 1921), S. 28.

[14] Ibidem, S. 57.

[15] *Sancti Bonaventure opera* (Moguntiae 1609), De Sancto Nicolao, S. 220.

Diese Legende wurde in Nordfrankreich im 12. Jahrhundert zum erstenmal bildlich dargestellt. In Deutschland erscheint sie im 14. Jahrhudert in der unteren Hälfte des Domfensters in Freiburg im Breisgan. Auf Grund einer Zusammenstellung der literarischen und kunstgeschichtlichen Zeugnisse darf vermutet werden, daß die Legende von den drei durch den heiligen Nikolaus auferweckten Schülern im Norden Frakreichs entstanden sei und mit ihr das Schutzpatronat des Heiligen über die Schüler verbunden wurde. Meisen nimmt an, daß Schülerpatronat das Primäre und die Legende erst aus diesem entstanden sei.

Er begründet diesen Gedanken durch die besonderen kulturellen Verhältnisse Nordfrankreichs im 12. Jahrhundert. Nordfrankreich war im 12. Jahrhundert der geistige Mittelpunkt Europas, es erlebte damals eine frühe Renaissance.

Aus allen Teilen Europas strömten wissbegierige junge Leute dort zusammen, um sich an den hochstehenden Bildungsstätten des Landes, unter denen eine Menge berühmter Stifts-und Domschulen waren, die Bildung der Zeit anzueignen. Die mit den Reisen von und nach den Orten dieser Schulen verbundenen Gefahren jener Zeit mögen auch die jungen Studenten dazu veranlaßt haben, sich nach einem besonderen Schutzpatron umzuschauen, wie ihn viele andere Berufsstände der Zeit hatten und verehrten. Bei den in Frankreich mächtig um sich greifenden Nikolauskult bot sich hier ein Patronat gerade dieses Heiligen fast von selbst dar. Eine leise Anspielung auf ein besonderes Verhältnis des hl. Nikolaus zu den Schülern findet sich in einer Predigt über den Heiligen, die in den Werken des Nikolaus von Clairvaux überliefert ist. Die Predigt beginnt mit den Worten:

> Nicolaus iste meus, imo et vester, electus
> ab utero, sanctus a puero, iuvenum gloria,
> reverentia senum, sacerdotum honor, splendor
> pontificum, conventum vestrum sua laetificat
> festivitate.

Den heist es im weiteren Verlaufe der Predigit an einer anderen Stelle:

> Praecipue sacerdotum et clericorum turba
> tanta devotione circa cultum eius afficitur,

ut in loco terrarum orbe quicumque undecunque
se contradant ad obsequendum tantae solemni-
tatis. Laetantur pueri, iuvenes gratulantur,
ornantur virgines, senes exhilarantur, et
omnis aetas personantur alludit. Unusquisque
autem habet materiam gaudiorum; ut laudent
paeri puerem ieiunantem, iuvenes iuvenem
liberantem, virgines virginum infamiam redi-
mentem, senes senis inopiam miserantem.
Juvenes et virgines, senses cum iunioribus
laudant nomen Domini huius.[16]

Ein besonderes Patronat des hl. Nikolaus über die Schüler ist hier in der Reihe der älteren Patronate des Heiligen noch nicht ausdrücklich genannt. Aber wenn als eifrige Verbreiter des Nikolauskultes die Geistlichen und die studierenden Jünglinge, die Priester werden wollen (praecipue sacerdotum et clericorum turba tanta devotione circa cultum eius afficitur...), besonders hervorgehoben werden, so entwickelt sich hier, nach der Ansicht Meisens, in Anbetracht dessen, daß diese Predigt in einem Kloster in Clairvaux mit seiner großen Pflanzschule für Klostergeistliche gehalten wurde, ein neues Patronat der Klosterschüler aus der besonderen Verehrung, die man in dem Klöstern dem Heiligen entgegenbrachte. Ein solches war eben keimhaft in den in der Predigt angedeuteten Patronaten der Knaben, Jünglinge und Geistlichen vorhanden. Da die Knaben und Jünglinge, die Klosterschulen besuchten, ja doch zum größten Teil die Absicht hatten, in den geistlichen Stand einzutreten, so waren gerade die Klosterschüler an seiner Verehrung interessiert, und leicht konnte sich so ein neues Patronat entwickeln. Nichts ist natürlicher als, daß man den Schülern der Klosterschulen gerade diesen Heiligen als leuchtendes Beispiel hingestellt hat. Sie hörten von ihm nicht nur im Unterricht und aus den Predigten, sie lernten seine größten Wundertaten im eigentlichen Sinne Wortes "spielend" kennen, da sie die Darsteller der dramatischen Szenen waren. Und hier wird es richtig sein, den Gedanken auszusprechen, daß das Patronat des heiligen Nikolaus über die Schüler mit der oben genannten Legende in Verbindung zu

[16] Karl Meisen, S. 296-300.

setzen ist. Das Interesse der Geistlichkeit und der Klosterchüler an der Verehrung des Heiligen schon in der Natur ihres Standes liegt. Das Interesse besteht ebenso für die anderen Heiligen rein westlicher Herkunft, wie z. Bsp. den heiligen Antonius, heiligen Florian, heiligen Jakob usw. Daß der hl. Nikolaus ausgerechnet zum Patron der Schüler auserwählt wurde, weist darauf hin, daß entweder in seiner Tätigkeit während des Lebens oder in seinen Wundertaten nach seinem Tode etwas ganz Besonderes vorhanden war, was auf eine enge Verbindung mit den Schülern hinweist und sie unmittelbar mit dem Heiligen, der ihr besonderer Wohltäter und Freund war, verband. Folgende Legenden können die innere Fühlung des Heiligen mit den Schülern allerdings nicht beweisen: die Legende von der Ausstattung der drei verarmten Jungrauen, die Legende von der Artemis, "die Seefahrergeschichte", "das Stratelatenwunder" oder irgend eine uns Legende, weil die Objekte, an denen sich die Wunder vollziehen, verschieden sind. Es badarf einer besonderen Wundertat des Heiligen, die an den Schülern vollbracht wurde, um ihnen durch dieses Wunder die Persönlickheit des heiligen Nikolaus näher zu bringen und die besondere Fürsorge des Heiligen für sie zu beweisen. Es mußte also ein Wunder des Heiligen entstehen, das den Schülern galt. Diese Legende schuf das Patronat. Das Interesse an der Verherrlichung des Heiligen, welches Meisen anführt, hat die Grundlage für die Entsehung des Patronates vorbereitet, die Entstehung selber aber mußte mit der Entstehung der Legende gleichzeitig eigetreten sein. Die Legende hat dieses durch die Verehrung selbst vorbereitete Patronat konkretisiert und geformt.

Wenn wir das Motiv und die Formung des Gegenstandes analysieren, so sehen wir eine auffallende Ähnlichkeit mit den Motiven und der Formung des Gegenstandes zweier anderer Legenden und zwar folgender: "Die Ausstattung der drei verarmten Jungfrauen" und "Das Stratelatenwunder".

In allen diesen Legenden treten drei Personen und der Heilige Nikolaus auf, welcher in wundertätiger Beziehung zu ihnen steht. Die Motive der Wundertätigkeit des Heiligen gleichen in der Legende der Auferstehung der Schüler mit den Handlungen des Heiligen in den zwei folgenden Legenden. Das Motiv der ersten Legende ist Barmherzigkeit

und Liebe zu den Schülern, das Motiv in der zweiten und dritten Legende ist ebenfalls Barmhefrzigkeit und Liebe. In der dritten Legende ist mehr die Liebe zur Wahreheit und Gerechtigkeit hervorgehoben als in den zwei vorhergehenden. Allen Anschein nach hatten die zwei letzten Legenden, die auf griechischer Grundlage entstanden sind, Einfluß auf die Entstehung der Legende von den Schülern. In die Komposition dieser Legende wurde die Barmherfzigkeit und Liebe aus der Legende über die Erretung der Jungfrauen wie auch die Barmherzigkeit und Liebe zur Wahrheit aus der Legende über die Erretung der drei Feldherren aufgenommen. Die Wundertätigkeit in der Legende über die Schüler erreichte hier einen höheren Grad als in den anderen zwei Legenden. Nachdem der hl. Nikolaus die drei Männer, durch sein wundervolles Erscheinen im Traum des Kaisers und seines Präfekten, vor dem Tode rettete, und nachdem er den drei Jungfrauen ihr Seelenheit bewahrte, indem er ihren Vater mit Gold beschenkte, vollbringt er in der Legende über die Schüler, indem er die drei Gemarterten wieder zum Leben erweckt, ein noch größeres Wunder; er besiegt mit der Macht Gottes selbst den Tod. Die Motive der Handlug der Todesverursacher stümmten übereins auch: In der Schülerlegende tötet der Herr (Schankwirt) die Schüler aus Geldgier, in der Jungfrauenlegende will der Vater die Töchter ins Seelenunheil stürzen aud der Gier nach Reichtum und in der Stratelatenlegende befiehlt der Kaiser die Tötung der Feldherren aus Gier nach Reichtum und Ruhm, die er sich dadurch verschaffen will. Diese Zusammenstellung der Legende geschah bestimmt auf westlicher Basis, da sie unter den griechischen Legenden nicht vorhanden ist, es geschah allem Anschein nach unter dem Einfluß der zwei oben angführten Legenden. Eine unter ihnen (die Jungfrauenlegende) begleitet sehr oft die Schülerlegende.

Die Schülerlegende und das sie geschaffene Patronat kamen in die Ukraine wahrscheinlich aus Deutschland und das ziemlich spät, vermutlich im 15. Jahrhundert. Sie fehlt in der Liste der Legenden von Leonid, sie wird auch in keinen Kirchentexten und Gebeten alter Herkunft erwähnt. Die Schlußfolgerung, daß diese Legende in Nordfrankreich entstanden sei und daß sie im 13. Jahrhundert weder in Italien noch in Deutschland vorhanden war, spricht für den Gedanken, daß sie in dieser

Zeit auch nicht in der Ukraine vorhanden gewesen sein konnte, da die Ukraine keine direkten Vorbindungen zu Frankreich hatte und somit diese Legende nur von den anderen zwei Ländern hätte übernehmen können. Der Inhalt der Legende auf ukrainischer Grundlage, welche sich in der *Ethnographischer Sammlung* von D. Hnatiuk unter dem Titel "Der heilige Nikolaus und die drei Studenten" befindet, ist:

> Einst kehrte der heilige Nikolaus ins Wirtshaus ein, um zu übernachten. Der Schankwirt war ein böser Mensch. Alle, die bei ihm übernachteten, brachte er um, legte das Fleisch in ein Faß und später briet und koche er es für die Gäste. Es geschah, daß dieses Schicksal drei Studenten ereilte, die zur Schule gingen. Der hl. Nikolaus kam ins Gasthaus und da er wußte, was hier geschehen war, befahl er allen Anwesenden mit ihm in die Kammer zu gehen. Hier sah man Menschenblut, Knochen und im Faß Menschenfleisch. Der hielige Nikolaus segnete das Fleisch und dieses verwandelte sich wieder in die lebenden Studenten.[17]

In den Grundzügen gleicht unsere Parallele dem im Westen entstandenen sujet und nur in den Details unterscheidet sie sich von ihm. In ukrainischer Legende ist das vom Schankwirt ausgeführte Verbrechen eine der vielen seiner Untaten, aber nur in diesem einen Falle vollbringt der hl. Nikolaus sein Wunder; in den Legenden werden keine vorhergehende Untaten des Schankwirtes erwähnt, sondern nur diese eine. Das Ziel des Verbrechens des Schankwirtes ist in den lateinischen Sujets die Gier, einen materiellen Wert (Geld) den Studenten wegzunehmen, als Gier zur Bereicherung durch fremdes Eigentum, wogegen in ukrainisher Legende die Bereicherungsgier im Gegenstand des Verbrechens selbst liegt (Verkauf des Fleisches der Ermordeten). In einem wie in dem anderen Falle tritt das Verbrechen des Mordes auf, aber dieses Verbrechen ist in unserer Legende noch mit der bewusten Absicht beschwert. Das Sujet dieser Legende finden wir in kurzer Form in einem Lyrniken-Lied unter dem Titel "Der heilige Nikolaus und die drei Studenten". Das Lied beginnt mit den Worten des Lobes zu Ehren des hl. Nikolaus:

[17] V. Hnatiuk, *Etnohrafichnyi zbirnyk* (Lviv, 1896), B. II, S. 35.

Cho sia suiatysh cholovechy virnyi?
Pohadai sobi, shcho Boh nezmyl'nyi;
Iak u frasunku, tak u zhalobi,
Dnes' Mykolai — my prosymo sobi,
Iak u den', tak u nochy: stan' nam do pomochy.
Chos'by tia spitkala fortuna zlaia,
Ni dufai nii vo shcho, noi Mykolaia;
Zo mii Mykolaia vyprosymo sobi,
Vin nii doznai zhadnoi shkody.
Iak tiashko zabolyt, vin Boha molyt,
A zaidet tia slontsi, zaidet tia zara,
Iak idesh u poly, smutlyva mora;
Ale try bladentsy ishly z nauky,
Stupyly do korshmy napytysia vody,
A ihk korshmar pomorduvai,
Iakbi tak chasom —
Prodai bi z mniasom.
Aly tym hostintsyin idy sviatyji Mykolai
I na tuiu korshmu na uvichlih stai.

Weiter folgt eingeflochten ein anderes Wunder des hl. Nikolaus, und zwar die Wiederbelebung des Esels, auf welchem der hl. Nikolaus zum Wirthaus kam und welchen der Schankwirt heimlich schlachtete, um ihn an die Reisenden zu verkaufen.

Nach diesem Wunder folgt die Fortsetzung des Liedes über das Wunder des hl. Nikolaus an den drei Studenten. Alle drei "bladentsi" sind auferstanden und gingen, dem hl. Nikolaus dankend, nach Hause:

Aly u toi hodyni u korshmarevi komori,
Usi troiy bladentsi u poustaly zhyvi,
Skachut z bochky, iako z kupel'ni,
Slichni, zdravi, iako anheli
I do nikh padaiut s'vatomu Mykolaiu
I nazad sia povyrtaly do svoho kraiu.

Hier wird die Segnung der Leichname durch den hl. Nikolaus nicht erwähnt, welche in den lateinischen Texten vorkommt, gleichfalls wird nicht erwähnt, daß der hl. Nikolaus mit den Gästen in die Kammer ging, wie es in den Prosatexten der Fall ist. Dies erklärt sich durch die

Charakteristik Lyrniken-Lieder[18] und Gebete und zwar durch die Umstellung nicht nur einzelner Worte und Sätze, sondern auch längerer Abschnitte; Auslassung von Haupt-und Nebenpersonen, Vermischung von Gedanken und auch ganzer Sujets eines Textes mit den anderen usw., so daß oft so ein Lyrniken-Lied oder Gebet lächerlich oder unverständlich erscheint. Das Patronat, verbunden mit dieser Legende, wird auf eine besondere Art den Schülern am Vorabend oder auch am Tag des Nikolaus (Zymnyi), am 6. Dezember, gefeiert.

Der Einfluß des Abendlandes auf die Gestaltung des heiligen Nikolaus in der Ukraine war sehr gering, bei weitem kleiner, wie der Einfluß griechischer Legenden. Die Legende von der Auferweckung der getöteten Schüler, welche auf der Basis der griechischen Legenden entstand und wahrscheinlich im 15. Jahrhundert in die Ukraine kam, ist anscheinend das einzige Beispiel dieses Einflußes.

[18] Lieder, die in der Begleitung des Instruments "Lyra" von den Lyrniken gesungen wurden.

Св. Миколай у леґендах грецького походження в Україні

(GREEK LEGENDS OF ST. NICHOLAS IN UKRAINE)

Убогі історичні відомості про життя св. Миколая створили широке поле для доповненя їх леґендами, які приходили в Україну з Греції і західньої Европи та знаходили там плодючий ґрунт. На ньому вони приймались і збагачувались новими леґендами, що вже творились самостійно на цьому ґрунті.[1] Та спершу слід відмітити різниці між поняттями "леґенда", "казка" і "міт", бо ці поняття часто плутають, уживаючи їх як синоніми.

Казка — це вигадана історія, яка не є пов'язана з будь-якою реальною особою або реальним місцем. "Був собі дід та баба й курочка ряба..." — це клясичний початок казки, за яким слідує сюжет, виключно видуманий для того, щоб зробити приємність слухачеві або, якщо це моральна казка, щоб висловити якусь практичну правду-науку.

Немає безконечного числа казок. Їх можна звести до певної

[1] Прізвища неукраїнських авторів, їх твори і цитати (за винятком перекладених на українську мову) подано згідно з їх написанням у джерелах, за винятком твердого знаку (ъ) на кінці російських слів; у цій позиції цей знак пропущено, бо він не мав ніякого звукового значення в словах наведених документів у період їх видання; в українських же контекстах ці дані написано згідно з "харківським" правописом. У церковнослов'янських словах збережено їх традиційне написання, за винятком "юсів", які передано буквами у/ю/ і а/я/, бо таке фонетичне значення мали "юси" в Київській Русі-Україні вже в половині 10-го століття (а може й раніше).

кількости типів, з яких ні один, здається, не належить до якогось окремого народу або навіть раси. Вони є, можна сказати, спільною спадщиною людства. Про це багато написано. Серед різних теорій переважають дві. Одна з них пояснює повторення тотожних тем і подібність їх форм схожістю людського розуму. Згідно з другою теорією колискою популярних казок, розповсюджених по всьому світі, є Індія.

Леґенда, навпаки, обов'язково має історичне або топографічне пов'язання. Вона відсилає уявні події до реальної особи, пов'язує фантастичні оповідання з існуючим місцем, наприклад, леґенда про св. апостола Андрея, який провістив побудову города Києва й його славу, леґенда про Александра Великого і т.п.

Це основні різниці між поняттями "казка" і "леґенда". Але в практиці ці різниці можуть не виступати чітко й ясно. Казка, наприклад, перелітаючи в іншу країну, може зупинитись на якомусь історичному домі, пам'ятнику тощо, або безіменне бутття-герой казки може прибрати історичне ім'я. Тоді казка стає леґендою, і це може ввести в оману дослідника, якщо він не знайде варіянту цього самого оповідання, який би виявив, що історичний елемент є чисто припадковим нарощенням. Коли ж виключити з леґенди елементи, які пов'язують її з дійсністю, тоді леґенда прибирає вид казки і часто може виринати трудність, щоб їх розплутати. Це явище зустрічаємо, наприклад, у відомій збірці "Тисяча й одна ніч" ("Арабські ночі"), бо в частинах її оповідань, хоч і дуже фантастичних, проявляється історична основа. Та може бути й таке, що, здавалось би, маємо до діла з чистим зразком леґенди, а зненацька виявляється, що це адаптація народної казки.

Суттю поняття "міт" є уособлення сили або абстрактної ідеї. Це пояснення природного явища як надприродне. Предметом міту є саме природні явища: сонце, місяць, звізди, море, день, ніч і т.п. Вони є в заряді богів і героїв. Інколи елементи міту можуть увійти в сюжет леґенди.

Леґенда про вирятування від смерти трьох невинно засуджених мужів. Це чи не найстарша грецька леґенда про св. Миколая, знана в Україні мабуть уже під кінець 10 століття, а може й раніш. Зідно з

авторитетними даними, вона постала за панування візантійського імператора Юстініяна (527-565) або невдовзі опісля і правдо-подібно в Мирах, у Ликії, для прославленя місцевого епископа Миколая.[2] Ця леґенда зайняла перше місце в грецькому переданні і стала основою, на якій і біля якої творились інші леґенди. Вона, можна сказати, в прославленні особи св. Миколая відограла в Візантії ролю майже половинної ваги в порівнанні з іншими леґендами. Текст цієї леґенди поміщений у письмі Методія до Теодора (Methodius ad Teodorum)[3], а опісля в збірці Симеона Метафраста (10-е століття).[4] Латинські переклади цієї леґенди зі збірки Метафраста є у Н. Кармінія Фальконія (Niccolo Carminio Falconi)[5] і Йоана Диякона (Johannes Diaconus) і видані Карлом Майзеном (Karl Meisen).[6] Текст цієї леґенди знаходимо також у збірці *Legenda Aurea* Якова де Ворaджіне (Jacobus de Voragine).[7]

В Україні ця леґенда мусіла також служити канвою, на якій плелись і інші леґендарні сюжети. Її немає у Никольського, в його списку п'ятнадцяти чудес[8], що його він узяв із праці архимандрита

[2] Karl Meisen, *Nikolauskult und Nikolausbrauch im Abendlande*, Heft 9-12, Düsseldorf, 1931, S. 216.

[3] Методій-патріярх Константинополя, 842-846. Пор. *Analecta Bollandiana II*, p. 150, §20: Primus quidam aut inter primos scripsit de vita sancti Nicolai Methodius patriarcha graeco sermonis.

[4] Symeon Metaphrastes, *Menologion. Biblioteca Hagiographica Graeca*, Brussels, 1909, pp. 267-292. З іменем Симеона Метафраста зв'язана ціла епоха в історії візантійської гагіографії. Він надав літературної форми утвореним раніше невідомими авторами леґендам про християнських святих і мучеників. Тому слово "Метафраст" ("переповідач" від грецького дієслова "metaphrazo" — переказую, переповідаю) з загального імени стало власним, прізвищем ученого візантійця, який жив, найправдоподібніше, в другій половині 10 ст.

[5] Niccolo Carminio Falconi, *Sancta Confessoris Pontificis et Celeberrimi Thaumaturgi Nicolai Acta Primagenia nuper Detecta*, Neapolis, 1751, pp. 98-105; Johannes Diaconus, ibid. pp. 119-122; Йоан Диякон написав *Vita sancti Nicolai episcopi* около 880 р.

[6] Karl Meisen, S. 527-30.

[7] Jacobus de Voragine, *Legenda Aurea*, або *Lombardica Historia*. Ed. T. Graesse, Dresden, 1846; нім. перл.: Richard Benz; англ. перл.: Ryan and H. Ripperger, London, 1941.

[8] Николай Никольскій, *Матеріалы для повременнаго списка русских писателей и их сочиненій* (X-XI вв.), СПб, 1906, ст. 332-352.

Леоніда "Посмертнія чудеса святителя Николая Мирликійскаго Чудотворця", виданої в *Памятниках древней письменности и искусства,* СПб, 1881. Та це не насуває сумніву щодо раннього існування цієї леґенди в Україні, бо авторові леґенди про чудо св. Миколая вирятування дитини в Києві, написаної між 1087 і 1091 рр., ця леґенда про вирятування від смерти трьох мужів була вже відома, і про це згадує власне арх. Леонід у вищенаведеній праці. Вона подана в списку 12 чудес у *Четьи Минеи,* 15-16в., М.А.М.Д., Оболен., 19/54, No. 46, 4⁰, 402 л. Там вона починється так: "Бысть во времена Константина царя..."; Имп. Публ. Библ., Погод., No. 659. Житія свв. полов. и кон. 17в., 4⁰, 513 л., де починається так: "Бысть в времяна Константина царя мятеж в Фригии..."[9] Згаданої праці арх. Леоніда не можна дістати і не відомо, чи вона взагалі існує в архівах СССР у сучасну пору. У каталогах Конґресової бібліотеки в Вашінґтоні її немає. Та, беручи до уваги те, що і перекладачі чуд св. Миколая в Київській Русі-Україні, і латинські перекладачі тих чуд користувались тим самим грецьким джерелом Симеона Метафраста або близькими до нього варіянтами (Леонід міг також мати болгарський переклад із грецького ориґіналу або його варіянту), можна без суттєвої помилки погодитись із болландистом Hipplyte Delehaye, який, говорячи про авторів життя святих і мучеників, каже: "There is no need to make any distinction between Greek and Latin writers. From a purely literary point of view, the Greeks are usually better than the Latins; but for historical sense there is nothing to choose between them and they must be thought of as forming one single group"[10] Це й можна застосувати до перекладачів грецьких текстів у Київській Русі і Болгарії. Вони зберігали сутність змісту грецьких текстів, особливо, коли такі тексти стосувались до життя святих.

Про вагомість цієї леґенди в Україні свідчить це, що її суть і основний мотив увійшли до богослужбових текстів Української

[9]Там же, ст. 354-356.

[10]Hippolite Delehaye, *The Legends of the Saints,* transl. by Donald Attwater, New York, 1962, p. 50.

Церкви на день 6 грудня і 9 травня (обидва за Юліянським календарем) та до акафисту в честь Святого. Першими проповідями в Україні найчастіше бували гомілії. Суть, отже, леґенди, виражена в богослужбовім тексті дуже коротко, мусіла бути розроблена самою фабулою, щоб вірні могли як слід цю суть зрозуміти. Через це Святий, заповнюючи уяву вірних конкретними подіями, зв'язаними з його особою, популяризувався, ставав для вірних ближчим.

Сюжет леґенди:[11]

За цісаря Константина Великого (272-337), римський цісар (324-337) вибухло у Фриґії повстання проти римського панування. Тоді на наказ цісаря полководці Непотіян, Урзус і Евполеоній відправились туди з військом, щоб привернути спокій. Однак несприятливі вітри на морі загнали їх до провінції Ликії, і вони опинились біля Мирів у порті Андріяка. Військо почало нищити край і вбивати мешканців, однак не без спротиву цих останніх. Хто знає, як ця акція була б покінчилась, якби не інтервенція о. Миколая, який явився там і за допомогою трьох полководців привернув знову спокій. Тоді о. Миколай запросив їх до себе. Вони прийшли якраз впору, щоб не допустити до злочину. Саме Євстахій, префект провінції, підкуплений грішми, засудив на смерть невинних трьох мужів. Про це довідався о. Миколай і негайно в супроводі своїх людей пішов до місця, де мала відбутися екзекуція. Засуджені, клячачи, з зав'язаними очима, чекали на смертний акт. У руці ката вже був витягнений меч. О. Миколай, розгніваний, вирвав меч із руки ката, відв'язав засуджених і пішов із ними до палати префекта. Відчинивши двері, побачив префекта, який ішов йому назустріч. О. Миколай промовив: "Ти, вороже, Божий, безстиднику, ти зломив закон Бога і смієш дивитись мені в лице!?" Префект признався до вини й жалкував про неї. На просьбу гостей-полководців о. Миколай прийняв його жаль і простив йому провину. Взявши благословення від о. Миколая, полководці відправились до Фриґії проти збунтованого населення і швидко покорили його без проливу кро-

[11] На основі латинського тексту Якова де Вораджіне в *Legenda Aurea* в німецькому перекладі Ричарда Бенца.

ви. Коли вони вернулися до Константинополя, цісар прийняв їх із великими почестями. Це не подобалося цісарським фаворитам, і вони підплатили найвищого цісарського дорадника Авлавія, щоб він обвинуватив полководців перед цісарем. Дорадник виконав змову, обвинувативши полководців у сплітці про погані діла й скандали цісаря. Цісар велів вкинути їх до в'язниці і без переслухання ще в цю ніч убити. Коли вони довідались про засуд від вартового в'язниці, роздерли на собі одежу й гірко плакали. Тоді один із них, Непотіян, пригадав собі, як то о. Миколай урятував був від смерти трьох невинно засуджених мужів і пригалав це іншим. Усі візвали помочі о. Миколая. Цієї самої ночі цісар мав сон: людина на ім'я Миколай, епископ із Мирів ликійських, явився йому і велів негайно звільнити трьох ув'язнених полководців, бо вони невинні. Якщо він цього не зробить, то Бог спричинить проти нього війну, в якій він згине й стане поживою для тварин і птахів. Подібний сон мав також Авлавій. Йому загрозив Миколай, що якщо він не направить кривди, заподіяної трьом полководцям, тобто не причиниться до їх звільнення, то його тіло точитимуть хроби, а дім буде зруйнований. Вранці зійшлися разом цісар і дорадник та розповіли один одному свої сни. Тоді веліли покликати негайно в'язнів і дорікали їм, що вони послуговуються якимись чарами і тим чином відбирають їм нічний спокій. Однак в'язні заперечили правдивість закиду й повторили свою невинність. Цісар спитав їх, чи вони знають особу, якій на ім'я Миколай. Вони, почувши це ім'я, піднесли руки вгору й молились, щоб Господь через заступництво св. Миколая вирятував їх від смерти; і розповіли цісареві про життя св. Миколая і його чуда. Цісар негайно дав їм свободу й велів їм піти подякувати Богові за рятунок через заслуги св. Миколая. При цьому дав їм дорогоцінні дарунки для Святого та просив їх молити його, щоб більше не загрожував цісареві, але щоб заступався за нього перед Богом. Звільнені полководці прийшли до св. Миколая, припали йому до ніг, кажучи "направду, ти єси слуга Божий і особливий відпоручник Ісуса Христа", та розповіли йому свою історію. Св. Миколай підніс руки й віддав хвалу Господеві, а їх, повчивши жити в чесноті, відіслав додому, до їх краю.

Ця леґенда, як видно, складається з двох частин. У першій час-

тині св. Миколай в останньому критичному моменті рятує трьох мужів, невинно засуджених на смерть підкупленим префектом. У другій частині він звільняє трьох полководців цісаря Константина, яких цісар засудив на смерть.

Перша частина, хоч і ідеалізована, більше зближена до можливої дійсности, ніж друга. Імена Константина і його префекта Авлавія були пов'язані в традиції. Авлавія стратив наступник Константина в 337 р.[12] Легко можна догадатись, що перша частина леґенди постала раніше та що другу частину додав інший автор. У той час така манера була звичайним явищем. Також можна собі уявити, що перша частина була основана на документі, можливо якомусь листі, який повідомляв про випадок у Мирах, де о. Миколай був єпископом та був у великій пошані. Такий документ або лист дав основу і заохоту іншому авторові скласти чудесне оповідання в другій частині в виді традиційної епічної розповіді.

В обох частинах виступає св. Миколай як такий, що ще за життя творить чуда. В християнській традиції немає певних прецедентів для чудотворної сили, характеристичної для св. Миколая. Тому й отримав він прикладку "чудотворець". Мотив чуд в обох частинах той самий, тобто любов до правди й справедливости. Їх творець виступає як чемпіон у відношенні до тодішнього зарозумілого, самопевного естаблішменту. Він радше своєю чеснотою, а не становищем, має вплив на імператорську бюрократію, робить її м'якшою, податливішою, більш уступною. Він є взірцевим світськими епископом, пастирем свого стада, постійно настороженим щодо безпеки і добробуту своїх невинних овець.

В леґенду втягнено два види тодішнього світу: державний, офіційний, з його бюрократизмом, канцелярщиною, формалізмом і світ духовий, опертий на християнських принципах. Згідно з традиціями греццько-римської культури, імператор був головою держави і одночасно його воля була кінцевим словом у справах релігії. Це був т.зв. цезаропапізм.[13] Імператор був "божественний" і "непе-

[12] *A Dictionary of Christian Biography,* 4 vols., London, 1877 ff., див. "Ablavius".
[13] Steven Runciman, *Byzantine Civilization,* London, 1933, pp. 113, 134.

реможний". Коли Константин рішив бути патроном християнської Церкви, то він поводився як її голова. Наприклад, на Нікейському Соборі він був предсідником і давав право голосу тим із учасників, хто бажав висловити свою опінію.

Верховні церковні ієрархи противилися цезаропапізмові, наприклад, Атаназій — патріярх Александрії, Іван Золотоустий — патріярх Константинополя. Юстин І під час своєї коронації обіцяв духовенству, що буде правити ним справедливо й лагідно. Але його наступник Юстиніян не був повздержливим. Згідно з твердженням Василієва і багатьох інших він був "найбільш помітним представником цезаропапітських тенденцій".[14] Він вибирав церковних ієрархів і патріярха з листи трьох номінатів; але міг цього й не придержуватися і міг скинути свого ставленика з релігійних або цивільних причин. Імператриця Теодора прогнала папу Сільверія до Патари, родинного міста св. Миколая, на користь Віґілія. Епископ Патари поїхав із протестом до самого імператора в Константинополі, Юстініяна, який зарядив слідство в цій справі. Можливо, цей історичний випадок став спонукою до створення фабули другої частини леґенди власне в той час.

Св. Миколай виявив себе в цій леґенді взірцевим послідовником навчання Христа: дати Богові те, що Боже, а цісареві те, що цісарське. Таким чином він поліпшував абсолютну імператорську владу, її злагіднював, гуманізував, не порушуючи її основ.

У понятті й вірі людей Бог найчастіше діє через своїх посередників-янголів і святих. Ця леґенда скріплювала це поняття й віру живим прикладом в особі св. Миколая. Його любов до правди й справедливости та спроможність застосувати її практично в надприродний спосіб підносили його до символу вищости християнства над поганством.

Чуда св. Миколая, розповсюджувані цією леґендою, давали спонуку до обрання його в Греції патроном несправедливо запідозрених і переслідуваних. В Україні мотиви чуд і самі чуда, описані

[14]Norman H. Baynes and H.St.L.B. Moss, *Byzantium: An Introduction to East Roman Civilization*, Oxford, 1948, p. 5.

в цій леґенді, винесли його на патрона християн, які знаходяться в найбільших потребах. Так, спочатку, перед офіціяльним уведенням християнства, він був патроном урожаю, бо ця ділянка становила собою найбільшу потребу житців України і вимагала найбільше помочі. Після введення християнства підо впливом навчання Церкви ця ділянка вимкнулася з-під покрову св. Миколая, перейшла під покров св. Юрія і св. Іллі, як це було й в Греції, а патронат св. Миколая, який був у Греції докладно окреслений, прибрав в Україні взагальнений вид "помічника в потребах". В Україні в обсязі цієї загальної риси витворювались інші риси, "помічникові в потребах" приділювано окремі ресорти справ, у яких він проявляв свої богоугодницькі діяння.

Леґенда про вивінування трьох зубожілих дів. Поруч із попередньою леґендою вона належить до першорядних леґенд про св. Миколая в грецькій Церкві. Її зустрічаємо в письмі Методія до Теодора (перед 843 р.) і в Симеона Метафраста. На Заході переклад її зробив Йоан Диякон. В Україні вона зайняла теж першорядне місце поруч із леґендою про вирятування від смерти трьох невинно засуджених мужів. Вона поміщена в праці архимандрита Леоніда "Посмертнія чудеса святителя Николая мирликійскаго чудотворца" під заг. "О тріех девицах" (або: Чюдо святаго Николы о некоем болярине)[15] і в *Етнографічному збірнику* Володимира Гнатюка.[16] Архимандрит Леонід уважав цю леґенду за оріґінальний український твір 11 століття, автором якого мав би бути переяславський єпископ Єфрем. Про це говорить Никольський, наводячи докази Леоніда та заперечуючи їх.[17]

Арґументи Леоніда такі:
Єфрем, монах Печерського манастиря, поїхав до Константинополя, де проживав в одному манастирі. Після 1062 р. преподобний Теодозій післав одного з монахів до Єфрема з дорученням, щоб Єфрем списав устав цього манастиря і прислав його Теодозієві, що

[15] *Памятники древнеруськой письменности и искусства,* СПб, 1881.
[16] В. Гнатюк, *Етнографічний збірник,* т. XIII, Львів, 1902, ст. 240.
[17] Н. Никольскій, *Матеріалы* ..., ст. 302-306, 354.

Єфрем і зробив. Після того, як Єфрем вернувся з Константинополя, його назначено митрополитом Переяслава.[18] Під час побуту в Константинополі стались там же два чуда, що їх записав сучасник; а Єфрем займався писанням (як це видно з примітки про те, що він прислав із Константинополя устав), то й написав твори, які стосуються до прославлення св. Миколая. До цих творів зараховує Леонід: а. "9 мая слово похвально на пренесеніе мощей иже во святых отца нашего Николы архиепископа мирликійскаго" (нач.: Се наста, братіе, свѣтлое праздѣнство предивнаго отца нашего и чудотворца Николы"; б. Мѣсяца мая в 9 день память (слово на) пренесеніе мощей святаго отца нашего Николы архиепископа мирликійскаго в Барград (нач.: "Присно убо должны есми братіе праздники Божія творяще в честь держати"); в. 14-15 чудес, поміщених у Леонідовому "Посмертнія чудеса святителя Николая мирликійскаго чудотворца".

Никольський не признає наукової вірогідности цим висновкам і твердженню Леоніда. Він каже, що ні час перебування Єфрема в Константинополі, ні українське походження згаданих пам'ятників, ні здогад про літературну діяльність Єфрема не встановлені задовільно й переконливо. Щоб захищати думку про українське походження цих творів, необхідно було б розглянути старовинну грецьку літературу про св. Миколая і перевірити, чи немає там оригіналів для вищезгаданих українських текстів. Та це завдання не виповнене, не всі грецькі твори є йому відомі, тому твердження Леоніда має сумнівну вартість.

Цю саму думку, що Никольський, захищав теж М. Голубинський.[19]

Однак питання, хто є автором згаданих творів і, в нашому конкретному випадку, автором леґенди про "вивінування трьох зубожілих дів", матиме більш певну й обґрунтовану відповідь, коли розглянемо латинську перекладну літературу. Згадана, саме, леґен-

[18] Там же, ст. 302-303.

[19] М. Голубинський, *Чтенія в императорском обществе истории и древностей россійскіх при Московском университете,* Москва, 1901; т. I, кн. 4, ст. 773.

да поміщена в праці Йоана Диякона *Vita beati Nicolai episcopi* (p. 268), написаній на прохання його приятеля Атаназія і взятій із грецького оригіналу. В своєму "Prologus in vitam beati Nicolai episcopi" пише Йоан Диякон до Атаназія:

> tandem aliquando assensum praebui et propter devotionem, quam te erga sanctissimum Dei famulum Nicolaum a progenitoribus habere gaudebas, nativitatem eius et vitam atque miracula, quae per eum Dominus gessit, latinis explicare sermonibus aggressus sum... Sane ortum sancti huius, et vitam et laudem quam Methodius Patriarcha Argolico stylo cuidam primicerio Theodoro nomine eum roganti perscribens, deo eo est prosecutus summatim breviterque studuimus carpere. Quod si cui forte displicet haec nostra brevis narratio, mittimus eum ad Graecorum phalerata commenta, quae tanto largius deo eo disseruntur, quanto illi et in genere et in sermone congruunt. Caetera quoque, miracula eius ex aliis doctoribus sumentes magis sensum, quam verba protulimus".[20]

З цього виходить, що цитована праця Йоана Диякона — це латинський переклад із грецького оригіналу патріярха Методія, а тим самим і леґенда про "вивінування трьох зубожілих дів" мусить бути перекладом грецького тексту. Отож ця леґенда в Леонідовому списку леґенд не може бути оригінальним українським твором, а грецьким, автором якого був Методій і який постав не в Україні, а в Греції.

Якби ця леґенда була оригінальним українським твором, то Методій мусів би перекласти його на грецьку мову і це мусіло б бути около 843 р., бо в тому часі Методій написав листа до Теодора, в якому помістив опис життя і чуд св. Миколая. Значить, українська леґенда мусіла б існувати вже перед тим роком. Та говорити про культ св. Миколая, особливо ж про його писемну фіксацію в Україні в тому періоді не можна. Евентуальність, що Йоан Диякон міг перекласти цю леґенду з українського оригіналу також відпадає, бо, поперше, в вищенаведеному листі докладно говориться про Методія, від якого Йоан Диякон перебрав відомості про життя й

[20] Ed. Karl Fissen, *Das Leben des heiligen Nikolaus in der altfranzösischen Literatur und seine Quellen*, Göttingen, 1921, S. 124.

чуда св. Миколая, а подруге, свій переклад зробив Йоан Диякон перед 872 р.,[21] де також ще не могло бути писемної фіксації культу св. Миколая в Україні (якщо б навіть можливість існування цього культу тоді була), бо тоді найправдоподібніше ще не було будь-якої писемної літератури в Україні взагалі.

Отож ця леґенда в Україні є або безпосереднім перекладом грецького ориґіналу Методія, або посереднім перекладом цього ж ориґіналу, а безпосереднім із *Vita beati Nicolai episcopi* Йоана Диякона і походить првдоподібно з 11 століття. За першою альтернативою промовляє взагальному продовжування в той час жвавих стосунків України з Візантією, виявом яких були їх взаїмні торговельні зв'язки, прийняття християнства з Греції, переклади грецьких богослужбових книг на староцерковнослов'янську мову, наслідування грецької організації монаших чинів і т.п. Доказом цього може бути перебування митрополита Єфрема в грецькому манастирі в Константинополі і спроможність познайомитися з грецькими текстами Методія, в яких говорилось власне про славного чудотворця св. Миколая, що, мабуть, під час перебування митрополита в Константинополі вчинив там же два чуда. Можливо, що й сам Єфрем був перекладачем цієї леґенди.

Другу альтернативу підтримують такі дані: В Никонівському літописі під 1091 р. читаємо, що "того же лѣта приде Теодор, грек митрополич от папи з Рима и принесе много мощей святых".[22] Немає сумніву, що цей Теодор був послом від київського митрополита Йоана II до папи Климента III[23] з відповіддю на письмо цього останнього.[24] Будучи в папи, в Римі або в Равенні, Теодор міг піти й до міста Барі, де вже були тоді дві розповіді клирика Никифора і архидиякона Йоана про перенесення мощей св. Миколая Чудо-

[21] Там же, ст. 15.

[22] М. Голубинскій, *Чтенія...*, ст. 773.

[23] Климента III (перед тим Ґрідон, архиєпископ Равенни) поставив на папу Генрика IV проти папи Григорія VII в червні 1080 р. на Синоді єпископів у Бріксені (див. о. д-р Ісидор Нагаєвський; *Історія римських архиєреїв*, 1 ч., Мюнхен, 1964, ст. 249).

[24] В цьому письмі папа Климент III пропонує митрополитові Йоанові II унію з Римом.

творця з Мирів до Барі і однією з яких користувався український автор двох "Похвальних слів" у честь перенесення мощей того ж Святого. Йому міг також попасти до рук переклад Йоана Диякона *Vita beati Nicolai episcopi*. Не виключене, що й сам Теодор міг бути автором двох "Похвальних слів" і перекласти на українську мову деякі леґенди зо згаданого твору Йоана Диякона, між ними й леґенду про "вивінування трьох зубожілих дів".[25] Цю леґенду (як теж "Похвальні слова") могли теж принести до Києва італійські купці, які тоді торгували з Україною, особливо з її головним торговельним осередком-Києвом. Перша альтернатива виглядає більше правдоподібною.

Фабула леґенди (за Володимиром Гнатюком):

Давно ходив по світі св. Миколай, навчаючи людей, спомагаючи бідних і привертаючи кожного до Божої ласки своєю наукою, Божою силою і Святим Духом. Рятував він людей із води, від звірів і розбійників та завжди чинив правду. Один господар хотів віддати своїх доньок на розпусту, щоб таким способом вони заробляли гроші. Однак до цього не допустив св. Миколай. Він невидимо явився під вікном дому господаря і вкинув крізь вікно торбину з грішми. Рано доньки найшли гроші, зраділи й сказали: "Дякуємо Богові, що Він про нас не забув і вчинив так, що ми тепер зможемо жити". Батько занехав свій грішний намір, і вони не забували ніколи про Бога та славили його угодника, св. Миколая, а цей не забував про них та давав їм завжди подарунок. Леґенда кінчається закликом, щоб ми, християни, не забували про св. Миколая та славили Бога, а св. Миколай помагатиме нам у всьому.

Основа й хід цієї фабули сходяться з основою й ходом фабули леґенди в перекладі Йоана Диякона. Проте в деяких деталях є розбіжності.

У латинському перекладі немає вступу, який є в українській леґенді. Леґенда в цьому перекладі починається:

> Accided, ut quidam convicaneus, eius nimium locuples ad tantam veniret inopiam, ut nec necessaria vitae haberet... Tres

[25] Теодор мусів знати добре українську мову. В Україні він натуралізувався, так що Україну називає своїм краєм.

virgines, quas habebat filias, fornicari constituit, ut earum saltem infami commercio ageret vitam.[26]

В українській леґенді сказано, що св. Миколай явився невидимо і вкинув крізь вікно торбину з грішми та що він не забував про дівок і пізніше також давав їм дарунки, а в латинському перекладі — св. Миколай приходить вночі тричі на протязі кількох днів і за кожним разом вкидає через вікно гроші:

> Inventa ergo eiusdam noctis hora sumens non modicum aurum, ligansque in panno, perexit domum viri. Paucis evolutis diebus advenit Nicolaus et iteratae vicis factum trini supplere cupiens numero aequale duorum iactavit talentum.[27]

Закінчення українського варіянту леґенди також різниться від латинського; в ньому наявний дидактичний момент, що стосується до всіх вірних, а в латинському перекладі вимога св. Миколая поставлена до батька трьох доньок:

> Sed breviter allocutus, exegit ab eo, ne cuiquam, Nicolaum huius rei iudicaret autorem... interdixit homini, ut nullo modo panderet nomen eius.

Тут св. Миколай практикує євангльську раду: хай ліва рука не знає, що права доброго робить.

Із наведених порівнянь видно, що леґенда українського запису В. Гнатюка перейшла вже довшу часову фазу від свого народження. Переказувана з покоління в покоління живе в народі, зберігаючи свою основу й стрижневий зміст і тільки в деталях відбігає від свого первовзору-джерела.

Квінтесенція цієї леґенди ввійшла також до змісту пісні українських лірників:

> Сиротам і удовам он йист опийкуном...
> Али ни уважай, шчо ни майим злота,
> Тільки просым Николайа сьвата усе
> У помоц.[28]

[26] Johannes Diaconus, *Vita beati Nicolai episcopi*, p. 268; Karl Fissen, S. 20.
[27] talentum = талант; сума грошей, рівна 60 мінам.
[28] В. Гнатюк, *Етнографічний збірник*, т. II, Львів, 1896, ст. 35.

Ця леґенда належала до найпопулярніших леґенд у Греції. В Італії вже в 10 столітті вона була в гимнах, які постали в Монте Кассіно, а в 11 ст. вже була драматизована. В Україні створила ґрунт для обрання св. Миколая патроном тих, хто вступає в подружній стан. Особливо дівчата, які бажають вийти заміж, вірять, що св. Миколай сповнить їх бажання, коли вони будуть щиро його про це просити. Ця віра виходить і поза ці вузькі межі та поширюється до віри, що цей Святий може зробити бідного багатим і щасливим. Таким чином він являється соціяльно-економічним добродієм. День 6 грудня, що його нарід обходить як празник св. Миколая, вважається днем щастя в році.

Леґенда про врятування моряків. В Візантії ця леґенда винесла св. Миколая на патрона моряків, а згодом на патрона всіх, що плавають на морі. Доказом цього є численні місця на побережжі Малої Азії і на островах, які мають назву Миколая.

Закріпленню цього патрона сприяли в певній мірі військово-політичні обставини Візантії. Імператори не звертали були серіозної уваги на потужну військово-морську фльоту. Щойно в обличчі росту сильної фльоти вандалів у північній Африці, під контролею яких у 5-ому столітті було Середземне море, збудило римських імператорів з цього пасивно-легковажного стану.

Після вандалів загрозою на морі стали перси, авари, а згодом араби. В 634-636 рр. впала Сирія, в 640-642 рр. — Єгипт, в 643-708 рр. — Африка, в 711 р. Еспанія. В 632 р. грецька фльота була розбита коло Александрії, а в 655 р. імператор Константин II особисто повів свою військово-морську фльоту до катастрофи коло побережжя Ликії, втрачаючи там 500 кораблів.

Мимо того, що греки винайшли були “стрільний вогонь”, візантійська фльота звичайно програвала бої і потребувала Божої помочі, щоб створити силу. В 698 р. морське адміралтейство скинуло імператора Леонтія і посадило на престіл адмірала; це саме воно зробило в 711 р., усуваючи з трону Юстініяна II. В 718 р. мусулманська фльота і армія зробили облогу самого Константинополя і держали його цілий рік аж новий імператор Лев III їх прогнав. В ті роки, від Юстініяна I (527-565) до Лева III (718), тобто в часі близько двохсот років, Константинопіль прийняв патронат св.

Миколая. Кожний текст леґенди і богословські тексти носять печать цього міста. Однією з причин мусіла бути його контроля морських берегів, яка була під патронатом св. Миколая. В Константинополі, перед його упадком 1453 р., було двадцять п'ять церков у честь св. Миколая.

З Візантії поширився цей патронат на Захід.

Не без значення була ця леґенда і в Україні. Вона, правдоподібно, мала вплив на постання української леґенди "О нѣкоем дѣтищи". Патронат, що його створила перша леґенда, поширила друга леґенда на всіх тих, що знаходяться в небезпеці на воді, а далі тих, що взагалі знаходяться на воді.

Зміст леґенди за перекладом Йоана Диякона (ст. 270):

На морі, де плив корабель, зірвалася страшна буря. Моряки звернулися з просьбою до св. Миколая, щоб вирятував їх із нещастя. Тоді явився між ними мужчина, який сказав: "Ви мене взивали, ось я між вами". Буря вспокоїлась, і мужчина зник. Моряки висіли в пристані, пішли до церкви і там пізнали цього мужчину. Ним був св. Миколай. Припавши йому до ніг, вони дякували йому за рятунок. Однак св. Миколай відмовився прийняти будь-яку хвалу для себе і велів їм цю хвалу віддати Богові.

У цій леґенді бачимо знов милосердя, що його Бог виявляє через свого угодника св. Миколая для тих, що його про це просять. Отож це прохання не мусить бути спрямоване безпосередньо до Бога; його можна спрямувати до нього через святих, тобто тих, що через свої заслуги в цьому житті одержали більше ласк від Бога, ніж інші і тим чином стали гіднішими, щоб вимолити в Нього помочі для потребуючих. Тому то й називає Церква св. Миколая Божим угодником.

Ця леґенда поміщена в праці архимандрита Леоніда "Посмертнія чудеса святителя Николая" під заг. "Яко избави корабль от потопа морскаго." Її варіянт знаходимо в *Етнографічному збірнику* В. Гнатюка під заг. "Святий Николай спасає чоловіка на воді."[29] Цей варіянт вказує на своє пізніше оформлення, зв'язане з його пристосуванням до місця перебування:

[29] В. Гнатюк, т. XIII, Львів, 1902, ст. 243.

Під весну один житець із Олеська вертався з млина в Коропці і журився, як переїхати через річку, бо лід уже топився. Коли він був на середині ріки, вода розколола лід, і він знайшовся на кризі, що почала плисти з водою. Загрожений небезпекою, він клякнув і став молитися до св. Миколая, щоб цей вирятував його з небезпеки. В цьому моменті крига задержалася при березі. Підігнавши коні батогом, він доїхав швидко до берега. Як тільки виїхав на берег, крига поплила далі. Вирятуваний дякував Богові і св. Миколаєві за рятунок.

Суттєвий атрибут св. Миколая в цьому сюжеті, тобто рятування з небезпеки води того, хто просить помочі, підкреслений також в українській лірницькій пісні:

> ...Шчебис потапав на мори,
> Прибудет Николайу скорий,
> Томко рци: сьвятий Николайу
> Ратуй нас! Зараз руци дайимо
> Усе в помоци.[30]

Леґендарний сюжет вищенаведеного українського запису є варіянтом леґенди про вирятування з морської небезпеки моряків або української леґенди "О нѣкоем дѣтищи". Основним змістом вона підходить радше до першої, а до другої зближує її тло. Та коли взяти до уваги це, що і леґенда про вирятування моряків (яка на українському ґрунті є перекладом грецького ориґіналу або латинського перекладу), і леґенда "О нѣкоем дѣтищи" були знані в Україні в 11 ст. і віддалені від себе мабуть дуже малим проміжком часу, а леґенда "св. Миколай спасає чоловіка на волі" — це продукція значно пізніша, яка, однак, постала не в окресленому часі, а розвинулась віддавна, то виглядає, що обидві перші леґенди є спільним джерелом останньої. Вони обидві мали вплив на цю останню, і тому її зміст подібний до змісту першої, а тло до тла другої леґенди.

Леґенда про Агрика і його сина Василя. Ця леґенда постала в Візантії на тлі політичних відносин 8 і 9 століть. У той час південна

[30] В. Гнатюк, т. II, ст. 35.

Італія (в ній такі міста, як Равенна, Неаполь), Калябрія (в ній місто Барі), Сіцілія і Апулія були провінціями візантійского цісарства. Під час ворожих нападів на Грецію її мешканці втікали до південної Італії, де знаходили притулок. Такими самими теренами азилю були Калябрія і Апулія для грецьких біженців із Сіцілії, які втікали перед нападами турків-сарацинів. Леґенда саме розповідає про випадок, який мав місце в часі такого нападу сарацинів у Катанії. Об'єктом нічного грабежу була одна церква, в якій молився юнак, що його якраз викрали були вороги. В страху звернувся він із горячим проханням до ікони св. Миколая, і цей у чудесний спосіб вернув його батькам.[31]

На цій леґенді основана також обширна леґендарна фабула на Заході.[32] Ось її короткий зміст:

Василя, сина селянина Агрика, в день празника св. Миколая, вночі, викрали кретські араби з церкви св. Миколая, що була в пристані біля Мирів ликійських. Врода хлопця спричинила, що поганський цісар купив його і зробив своїм підчашим. Для батьків свято радости стало днем смутку й болю. Мати була так пригноблена, що наступного року не хотіла святкувати празника св. Миколая. Тільки по важких намаганнях удалось її чоловікові намовити її до святкування. Коли гості сиділи за столом і розмовляли про Василя, надворі почали гавкати собаки. Батько Василя виглянув і наче остовпів, бо побачив власне свого сина в арабському одінні з повною чаркою в руці. Коли розговорились, Василь розповів, як його під час виконування обов'язку підчашого захопила якась невидима сила. Майже непритомний зо страху побачив він св. Миколая, який додав йому відваги. Дарованого сина припровадив батько до матері і гостей.

У Майзена вороги називаються "кретські араби", в Йоана Дияконa — "Agareni", у Кармінія Фальконія "Agarensi". В Йоана Диякона батько викраденого хлопця — Cethron, мати — Ephrosine.

[31] Karl Meisen, S. 61; August Anrich, *Hagios Nikolaos*, Leipzig, 1913, vol. I, S. 345f.

[32] Johannes Diaconus, p. 277; Niccolo Carminio Falconi; *Biblioteca hagiographica Graeca*, Bruxellis, 1895, p. 97.

Однак у цього останнього немає згадки, де відбулося викрадення хлопця /... Venerunt autem Agareni (Saraceni)[33] et praedati sunt omnes vires et mulieres, inter quosetiam puer captus est.../; у Майзена сказано, що хлопця викрали з церкви.

В Україні ця леґенда поміщена в праці Леоніда "Посмертнія чудеса..." під заг. "О Агрике и о сыну его Васильи". Коротка згадка про чудо знаходиться також у зображенні св. Миколая на т.зв. "Поясі Богородиці".[34] В цій леґенді виявляється новий атрибут св. Миколая, а саме, особливе добродіяння й опіка над дітьми й підлітками, взятими з-під опіки батьків. У зв'язку з цим св. Миколай став в Україні патроном молоді, яка попала в полон під час ворожих навал, особливо в яничари до татарів і турків.

Леґенда про пресвітера. Її слід віднести до того самого часу й політичних стосунків, що й попередню леґенду. Вона поміщена в Леонідовому списку посмертних чуд св. Миколая під назвою "Чудо о попе Христофоре" (або: Чудо святого Николы како избави от меча Прохора попа от горкія смерти). Опис цього чуда є в латинському перекладі (з грецького оригіналу) Кармінія Фальконія п.заг. "De Presbytero" Згадка про нього є також у "Поясі Богородиці". Короткий зміст:

Під час Служби Божої сарацини взяли в полон одного сіцілійського пресвітера. Від смерти вирятував його св. Миколай, до якого молився засуджений на смерть пресвітер, і повернув його до його батьківщини.

Цією і попередньою леґендою поширився патронат св. Миколая на полонених і одночасно зміцнився вже раніше утворений патронат над невинно засудженими.

Леґенда про чудесну ікону св. Миколая. Ця леґенда в грецько-

[33]Сарацини — це в античних часах араби; в середньовіччі — мохаммедани, загальна назва, якою християни окреслювали всіх мусульман, проти яких воювали хрестоносці.

[34]А.И. Яцимирскій, "К истории ложных молитв в южнославянской письменности", *Извѣстія отдѣленія русскаго языка и словесности, Имп. Акад. Наук,* СПб, 1913, т. XIII, кн. 3, ст. 40.

му переданні поміщена в *Codex Vaticanus Graecus 821* з 11 ст. (1077 р.) Вона є наймолодшою леґендою серед інших грецьких леґенд. На Заході вона поміщена в перекладі Йоана Диякона *Vita beati Nicolai episcopi.* Її немає в Леонідовому списку посмертних чуд св. Миколая, ні не відображена вона в богослужбових текстах. Знаходимо її в *Етнографічному збірнику* В. Гнатюка під заг. "Св. Миколай і злодії".
Зміст:

Один "лютер", вибираючись у дорогу, повісив образ св. Миколая над касою, в якій мав багато грошей, і поручив йому вартувати, щоб злодії не вкрали грошей під час його ("лютера") неприсутности. При цьому загрозив, що ікону розіб'є, як злодії викрадуть гроші. Таке рішення зробив він тому, що чув, що св. Миколай — це великий патрон. Однак, під час неприсутности господаря злодії вкрали в нього гроші. Коли власник вернувся і грошей не застав, взяв кия і розбив образ св. Миколая. По дорозі явився злодіям св. Миколай і велів їм звернути власникові гроші, а за це обіцяв їм нагородити їх двократною сумою грошей. Злодії вчинили так, як він велів. Із вдячности господар дав їм половину суми звернених йому грошей. Св. Миколай сповнив свою обіцянку, так що злодії, забезпечившись грішми, перестали красти. "Лютер" купив інший образ св. Миколая, дав його посвятити і повісив над касою та щоденно до нього молився.

Ця леґенда в вищенаведеній формі прийшла в Україну, правдоподібно, не безпосередньо з Греції[35], а посередньо, з Німеччини після реформації Лютера. Цей здогад виправдується вжитком слова "лютер", тобто "лютеранин", дарма що це слово значить "чужинець" у цьому контексті. Церковна революція Лютера в першій половині 16 ст. не мала серед українського народу розкольницького впливу, як це було в Німеччині. Там у розгарі релігійних спорів відпала в лютеран віра в християнських святих, яка була в католиків. Святі перестали бути в них Божими угодниками. Бог творить чуда безпосередньо, а не через святих. Тим чином особа св. Ми-

[35] За Майзеном — вона постала, мабуть, в Калябрії, грецькій провінції.

колая відійшла в них цілком у тінь і злилася з різдвяним дитятком Ісус. Мотивом леґенди є виказати правдивість науки католицької Церкви своїм епілогом. "Лютер" признає чудо, яке сталося завдяки св. Миколаєві, купує його образ і щоденно молиться до нього. Можливо, що ця леґенда постала в німецьких католицьких середовищах. У *Vita beati Nicolai episcopi* Йоана Диякона ця леґенда починається нападом вандалів із Африки на Калябрію, нищенням її вогнем та схопленням і вивезенням багатьох полонених. Один із вандалів, митник, знаходить між своєю здобиччю гарно намальований образ. Від одного полоненого довідується він, що цей образ представляє християнського святого, який має чудотворну силу. На цій підставі дає образові поручення стерегти його дім і гроші. Далі зміст такий, як у нашій леґенді, лиш немає в ньому обіцянки, яку дав злодіям св. Миколай. Закінчення таке: митник-поганин навертається на християнську віру. Отож, узагальному, фабули леґенди ті самі, тільки місце вандала-поганина в латинському опрацьованні займає "лютер" в українському записі.

Цей процес цілеспрямованости мусів відбутись на німецькому ґрунті і звідти прийти в Україну прямо або через Польщу під впливом лютеранської революції-реформації, хоч ця остання, як правильно каже Д. Чижевський, охопила майже виключно шляхетські неширокі кола і лише деякі відгуки її ідей пройшли до ширших кіл українського народу.[36] Спільною метою є виявлення чудотворної сили образа св. Миколая, яка полягає в тому, що цей Святий являється злодіям і впливає на їх рішення віддати вкрадені гроші їх власникові. Позитивне й ефективне осягнення цієї мети головною особою сюжету вказує на це, що цю особу визнано патроном приватної власности, особливо ж опікуном загублених речей. Цю ролю сповняє св. Миколай серед українського народу подібно, як св. Антоній серед поляків, німців і австрійців. Правда, в двадцятих і тридцятих роках культ цього Святого Заходу поширився також на західніх землях України, в Галичині, і в вірі його поклонників

[36] Дмитро Чижевський, *Історія української літератури*, Нью Йорк, 1956, ст. 224.

він був надійним лікарем хворіб для всіх людей, а передусім дітей (головно т.зв. "недуги св. Антонія", або "конвульсії"), і помічником у віднайденні загублених речей, проте патронат св. Миколая в цій останній ділянці не зістав звужений.

Поруч із цим патронатом у цій леґенді є теж джерело патронату св. Миколая над злодіями. Злодії теж обирають його на свого патрона й помічника в переведенні злодійського вчинку. Тут, отже, бачимо певний парадокс: з одного боку св. Миколай захищає власність перед крадіжжю, а з другого — своєю добротою дає злодіям надію на здійснення їх переступників. Цей парадокс вказує на велику популярність св. Миколая та на всебічність почитання його особи серед різних верств українського суспільства.

Леґенда про три ікони. Ця леґенда постала в Греції в часах іконоборства. Вона поміщена в Леонідовому списку посмертних чуд св. Миколая. Її короткий зміст знаходиться також в *Історії російської літератури* Е.В. Анічкова і ін.[37]

Один чоловік, на ім'я Теофан, бачив у сні, що йому слід намалювати три ікони: св. Богородицю, Ісуса Христа і св. Миколая. Закінчивши роботу, Теофан попросив патріярха посвятити образи. Патріярх дивується, що йому прийшло до голови намалювати крім Ісуса і Божої Матері ще й св. Миколая, "це бо є образ *смердовича*". Однак пізніше св. Миколай спасає того патріярха з глибини моря і говорить йому: "Чи потрібний смердович там, дем треба дати поміч".

Характер леґенди, як видно, полемічний, спрямований проти іконоборства. Цим і пояснюється вислів "смердович"[38].

Леґенда про уздоровлення біснуватого. На Заході цю леґенду

[37] В. Аничков, А.К. Бороздин і Д.Н. Овсянико-Куликовскій, *История русской литературы,* Москва, 1908, т. І.

[38] "смердович"= син смерда; смерд — це селянин, людина нижчого стану в Київській Русі-Україні. Карамзин, Преображенський і ін. думають, що це слово походить від "смердіти", значить мало презирливе значення. П. Ковалів твердить, що такого значення це слово не мало. Більш правдоподібною є думка перших тлумачів, бо якщо зі словом "смердович" (син смерда) не асоціювалась презирливість, то це слово не було б викликало репліки св. Миколая, забарвленої певним почуттям образи.

записав Карміній Фальконій під заг. "De monacho Nicolao", і французький автор Delius Wace. Вона поміщена в Леонідовому списку посмертних чудес св. Миколая.[39]

Коротки зміст:

Злий дух мучив паралітика й кидав ним так, що він розбив об каміння голову. Троє людей привели його до манастиря і просили св. Миколая, щоб його уздоровив. Св. Миколай, зробивши знак рукою, вигнав злого духа, і хворий став здоровим.

В цій леґенді підкреслена сила правдивого Бога виганяти злого духа, тобто влада Бога над дияволом. Св. Миколай служить тут знаряддям для виявлення цієї сили і влади. Таким чином він наближається до Христа Спасителя, тому то й грецька, і українська, і латинська Церква називає св. Миколая другим спасителем, або визволителем. Як Христос спас увесь людський рід від гріховної смерти, так св. Миколай спасає поодиноких людей від насильства диявола силою, що її дав йому Бог.

[39] Н. Никольскій, *Матеріалы...*, ст. 355.

The Origin, Development and Contemporary Destiny of the Byliny of Rus'-Ukraine (Kyjivan, Kievan Rus')

(An Outline)

The collectors of the epic songs "byliny"[1] in Russia and Ukraine in the 18th and 19th centuries, discovered the earliest bylina texts of the 17th and the first half of the 18th centuries. These texts, 45 in total, were spread in the northern provinces of Russia (the Arkhangelsk and Olonetsk provinces), in its middle part (the Iaroslavsk, Tversk, Moscow and Vladimir provinces), on Volga river and in the south (the regions on the Don river and northern Caucasus).[2] No records of byliny were found in Ukraine.

This led some scholars to assume that byliny were exclusively a

[1] The term "bylina" was introduced into scholarly usage in the thirties of the 19th century by I.P. Sakharov. "Bylina" is an epic song reflecting the historic reality in broad artistic generalizations. It collects and unites the impressions of the whole series of events. According to B.N. Propp, "epos", meaning "bylina," "depicts the idealistic reality and idealistic heroes." The transliteration of Cyrillic in this paper is one used by the Library of Congress.

[2] Most texts containing byliny deal with Il'ia Muromets. They reflect the following byliny about him: *Il'ia Muromets i Solovei-Razboinyk* (in two versions), *Il'ia i razboinyk, Istselenie Il'ii Muromtsa, Il'ia Muromets i Idolyshche*. The other bylina texts are: *Mykhail Danylovych, Mykhail Potok, Ivan Hodynovych, Stavro Hodynovych,* and fragments of the bylina *Oleksii Popovych i Tuharyn* (A.M. Astakhova, *Byliny. Itogi i problemy izucheniia* (Moscow-Leningrad: "Nauka," 1966), 167-69.

creation of the Russian people and that the Ukrainian people never knew byliny and had not participated in their creation. Such opinion was characteristic, e.g., of Pogodin[3] and Kostomarov. The latter said that "byliny is a purely north Russian production, a work of exclusively Great Russian branch."[4] By the word "north" Kostomarov understood not the whole northern land but the territory north from the Kyjivan State. Even if there had been something made up in that state, it was completely remade by the Russians, according to Kostomarov. S.K. Shambinago maintained that byliny found in Russia originated in the Moscow period trying to prove it by the indication of the similarity between some bylina plots and the episodes of the Russian war-tales of the 15th-16th centuries, by the reflection in byliny of the historical events and conditions of the Moscow times, such as "order of precedence" (mestnichestvo), the portrayal of the prince reflecting the personality of Ivan the Terrible, as well as the similarity between the features of the byliny daily round and the daily round features of the Moscow period, e.g., architectural peculiarities, defensive works etc.[5] According to Khalanskii, the bylina epos as an integral formation did not exist in Kyjivan Rus'. Kyjivan elements were only formal, external appendages to the regional bylina plots composed in the north during the Moscow period. The names "Kiev" and "Vladimir" were introduced artificially into the content of the north bylina plots.[6] However, the examination of the Ukrainian folklore by P. Kulish,[7] O. Miller[8] M.

[3] M.P. Pogodin, "Zapiska o drevnem iazyke russkom," in *Izvestiia imp. Akademii nauk po otdeleniiu iazyka i slovesnosti,* v. 5 (Spb. 1856), 77-78; V.F. Miller, *Ocherki russkoi narodnoi slovesnoti,* v.1 (Moscow: T-vo I.D. Sytina, 1897), 67-68.

[4] N.I. Kostomarov, "Razbor istorii Zabelina" in *Russkaia starina* (ianvar', 1877), 174-75.

[5] S.K. Shambinago, "Drevnerusskoe zhilishche po bylinam," in *Iubileinyi sbornik v chest' V.F. Millera* (Moscow, 1900); "Zastava bohatyrskaia," in Sbornik statei v chest' M.K. Liubavskogo (Pgr., 1917).

[6] M. Khalanskii, *Velikorusskie byliny kievskogo tsykla* (Warszawa, 1885), 218.

[7] P. Kulish, *Zapiski o iuzhnoi Rusi,* v. 2 (SPb., 1857), 48. He saw the plot of the bylina about Il'ia Muromets in one of the Ukrainian tales.

[8] O.F. Miller, "Velikorusskie byliny i malorusskie dumy," in *Trudy III Arkheologicheskogo sъezda v Rossii,* No. 2 (Kiev, 1878), 293. He indicated traces of the bylina epos in Ukrainian "dumy."

Drahomanov,[9] N.P. Petrov,[10] N. Dashkevych,[11] A. Loboda,[12] M. Plisetskii[13] and M. Hrushevs'kyi[14] shoved that it contained clear traces of the bylina epos of the Kyjivan Rus' so there is no reason to consider these traces the results of the later influence of the Russian epos.

The spread of the bylina stories about the hero /bohatyr/ Il'ia Muromets in Ukraine was witnessed by Eric Lassota, the Austrian emissary to zaporozhtsi, who was to Kyjiv in 1594. In his itinerary notes he mentioned the grave of Il'ia Muromets[15] which he saw in St. Sophia Cathedral and he described this occurence by saying that he saw the grave "of the prominent hero or bohatyr, of whom many stories are narrated."[16] On the grounds of this, A.M. Astakhova made a correct inference that it is possible that at that time the Ukrainian people, besides legends about this hero, also kept in their memory some byliny.[17]

[9] M. Drahomanov, *Malorossiiskie narodnye predaniia i rasskazy* (Kiev, 1876). In this collection there are several works which approximate byliny.

[10] N.P. Petrov, "Sledy severnorussogo bylevogo eposa v iuzhnorusskoi narodnoi literature." in *Trudy Kievskoi dukhovnoi akademii* (No. 5, Kiev, 1878), 365. He thought that byliny about the heroes and the Novhorod byliny developed from the old Ukrainian poetry in which "the seeds and residues have remained up to now."

[11] N. Dashkevych, "O sushchestvovanii bylin v iuzhnoi Rusi do poloviny XVII veka," in *Chteniia v obshchestve Nestora-Letopistsa* (kn. 2, 1888), 208. According to his opinion, some "dumy" developed from byliny; they did not destroy byliny but present next stage of the bylina development.

[12] A.M. Loboda, *Russkii bohatyrskii epos* (Kyjiv, 1896), 90-96. In this work he indicated traces of the bylina epos in other forms of the Ukrainian folklore.

[13] M.M. Plisetskii, *Vzaimosviazi russkogo i ukrainskogo eposa* (Moscow: AN USSR, 1963). In this book Plisetskii discusses numerous bylina motives and plots found in the Ukrainian dumy, legends and tales, in wedding songs, ballads etc. (E.g., byliny about Vasilii Ignat'evich and Mikhail Danilovich vs. Ukrainian legend about Mykhailyk and Golden Gates.)

[14] M. Hrushevs'kyi, *Istoriia ukrainskoi literatury,* v. 4 (New York: Knyhospilka, 1960), 59-82.

[15] Most scholars think that the word "Muromets" is a derivative of "Murom," a provincial north-east town Murom. But it could also be a derivative of "Murovs'k" or "Muroviis'k," the name of the town in the Chernihiv province.

[16] A.M. Loboda, *Russkii bohatyrskii epos.* 15.

[17] A.M. Astakhova, *Byliny. Itogi i problemy izucheniia* (Moscow-Leningrad: "Nauka," 1966), 219.

Among the manuscripts of the 16th-17th centuries reflecting bylina plots, there is a group of so called "sebezhsk" texts about Il'ia Muromets and Solovei-Razboinyk (Nightingdale-Robber). They contain an episode of Il'ia Muromets' liberation of the town of Sebezh during his journey to Kyjiv. This town was situated near the city of Vitebsk in Belorussia, and it often had to defend itself from the Lithuanian and Polish attacks. In the 16th century the texts with this episode went back to the narration of the bylina, written down by an anonymous lover of the bylina creation. The town of Sebezh in this bylina most likely replaced the city of Chernihiv of the older versions of this bylina which had been made up in Kyjivan Rus'. Consequently, such a version (or versions) of this bylina existed in Ukraine before the 16th century.

Various references to professional "singers" of the Kyjivan period also tell us about the existence of the bylina epos in Kyjivan Rus'. In the Galician-Volhynian chronicle under 1240 one reads about such singer Mytusa. There is also a note that upon a victorious campaign of prince Danylo and Vasyl'ko against Jatvingians "a glorious song was sung" for them. *The Tail of Ihor's Campaign* mentions of the poet-singer (pesnotvorets') Boyan. The author of this Tail regrets that Boyan had not sung Ihor's campaign against Polovtsi for he would have done it much better, in an artistic way.

Convinced of the early existence of the bylina epos, that is in the Kyjivan period, was A.N. Veselovskii. According to him, this epos, contrary to Khalanskii's assertion, was brought to the North, where it was "joined by the local north Russian legends and songs." There it continued to live "in new day round conditions and people's interests, little by little adjusting itself to both of them without changing its association with the byliny of the Kyjivan cycle. This was a kind of a frame, outlining the whole but open to the influence of new plots of fantasy."[18] It means, according to Veselovskii, the byliny of Kyjivan Rus' were formed in a cycle and only later on reached Russia and attracted Rus-

[18] A.N. Veselovskii, "Russkii epos i novye ego issledovateli — Khalanskii i Damberg," in *Vertnik Evropy* (iiul', 1888), 152-53.

sian byliny, and not vice versa. Later features in the Kyijvan byliny are explained by the versional layers of the subsequent epochs.

D.S. Likhachov was right to assume that the formation of the byliny of the Kyjivan cycle should have taken place before 1478, the year of the annexation of Novhorod to Moscow, because the Novhorod byliny were not included in that cycle.[19]

That the heroic byliny were composed in Kyjivan Rus' and most likely many of them in the premongolian period, and that they were united there into the Kyjivan cycle, is also evidenced by the chronicle notes about the bylina heroes Dobrynia and Oleksii Popovych. These notes were based on the already existing folk legends about both heroes, and in one of these notes Oleksii Popovich is even referred to the beginning of the eleventh century, that is, to the time of Volodymyr the Great (the Nikon Chronicle under 6508, 6509, 65612).[20]

Some information of the existence of the bylina epos in Kyjivan Rus' is also found in the sources of the foreign writers and scholars. For instance, the Polish writer Mikolaj Rej from Naglovice in his work *Zwierzyniec* (The Bestiary, published in 1562) speaks of the Kyjivan hero "Charlatan Churylo" (i.e., hero Churylo). This hero is also mentioned by Sebastion Klonowicz in his work *Worek Judaszów* (Yudas Sack, 1600).

In the German poem of the Lombard cycle about Ortnit (13 century) we find the hero "Ilias von Reuzzen (Reuzen)." There the name of Ilia appears by the name Volodymyr — the kig of Ruzsiland, Il'ia's Rus'yan nationality, and his closeness to "the kind off Rus'" are indicated, and the cities of Kyjivan Rus', Kyjiv, Polotsk, and Smolensk are mentioned. All this makes a strong point to assume that Il'ia of the German poem and Il'ia Muromets are one and the same character. Heroic deeds of Il'ia of that poem resemble heroic deeds of Il'ia

[19] D.S. Likhachev, "Kul'tura Rusi na rubezhe 14-15 vekov," in *Istoricheskii zhurnal* (No. 1, 1943), 44-45.

[20] D.S. Likhachev, "Ustnye letopysi v sostave Povesti vremennykh let" in *Istoricheskie zapiski* (No. 17, Moscow-Leningrad, 1945); "Letopisnye izvestiia ob Alexandre Popoviche," in *TODRL*, v. VII (Moscow-Leningrad, 1949).

Muromets so that there is a reason to assume that Il'ia of that poem was brought into it from the bylina epos of Kyjivan Rus'. Subsequently, the bylina or the legend about Il'ia Muromets timed to the name of the prince Volodymyr as to an epic centre, were composed in the 12th century.[21]

The names of the cities of Kyjiv in each hero bylina, of the city of Chernihiv, the Dnipro river, as well as the features of the nature characteristic only of the south territories of Kyjivan Rus', such as steppe spaces, huge oak trees not found in the north etc., indicate that byliny were composed in Kyjivan Rus', the present territory of Ukraine. The old Ukrainian origin of many of today's byliny is particularly reflected in those historical events, which served as a basis of the contents of the heroic epos, mainly battles with nomads (Pechenegs, Polovtsians, Tatars) who used to invade Rus' for centuries, destroyed cities, villages, killed elders and children and took away the youth as captives.

It is impossible to give an absolute or even a relative chronolgy of the heroic byliny, and that is not necessary. The indisputable fact that they were composed as a response to the totality of the events of the historical reality in artistic generalizations and as an expression of the people's consciousness and defense of freedom and independence. Most likely, they were composed between the 10th and 13th centuries and their new features and numerous versions in the following centuries.

The heroic byliny composed in Kyijvan Rus' most likely are as follows: *Istselenie Il'i Muromtsa* (The Healing of Il'ia Muromets), *Il'ia Muromets i Solovei Razboinyk* (Il'ia Muromets and the Nightingale-Robber), *Il'ia Muromets i Sviatohor,*[22] *Il'ia Muromets i Sokol'nyk, Il'ia Muromets i Kalyn-tsar, Il'ia Muromets i Idolyshche Pohanoe* (Il'ia Muromets and a Wild Idol), *Ssora Il'i Murometsa s kniazem Vladymy-*

[21] A.M. Astakhova, *Il'ia Muromets* (Moscow-Leningrad: AN USSR), 408-9.

[22] Out of seven plots about Sviatohor, two refer to epos: a) a story about Sviatohor's riding into a saddle bag which he cannot heave and b) a story about his lying down into the coffin which slams down behind him. The first of these stories originated, probably, in the pre-Kyjivan period because all the Sviatohor's features entirely differ from the features of the Kyjivan heroes; the second story which includes the hero Il'ia Muromets is apparently a parallel formation in the Kyjivan period.

rom[23] (Il'ia Muromet's Quarrel with the Prince Vladymyr), *Dobrynia i Tuharyn Zmievych, Sukhman, Mykhailo Danylovych, Vasylii Ihnat'evych i Batyha.* These byliny were combined into a "Kyjivan cycle" with its centre of Kyjiv headed by Volodymyr.

In these byliny Volodymyr performs no heroic deeds, they are performed by the heroes, distinct in their appearance, age, personal character and heroic deeds. Though they are from different provinces — Il'ia Muromets from Murom or Murovs'k (or Murovisk), Dobrynia form Razan', Oleksii Popovich from Rostov etc., all of them come to the capital city of Kyjiv and from that moment they become the heroes of the epos. All of them arrive to Kyjiv voluntarily with the intention to defend their country.[24]

Besides these byliny, which probably were sung all over Kyjivan Rus', local byliny were composed too, e.g., in Halich, where, according to Vsevolod Miller, byliny about Duke, Churylo, Potyk, and Dunai originated.[25] Some byliny were made up in Suzdal', Chernihiv, Moscow[26] and Novhorod. V.Ia. Propp considers the Novhorod province the only one which possessed its distinct local creative features, e.g., byliny about *Sadko* and about *Vasylii Buslaevych*[27] These local byliny bear no military character. The larger part of them are byliny about matchmaking (*Sadko, Mykhailo Potok, Ivan Hodynovych, Dunai, Kazaryn, Solovei Budymyrovych*), the other are in the world of fantasy (*Il'ia Muromets i syn, Try poïzdky Il'i, Dobrynia i Marynka, Dobrynia v otъezde i neudavshaiasia zhenit'ba Alëshi*).[28]

[23] In the people's language of the Kyjivan period there was a pleophony, hence the name "Vladimir" sounded "Volodymyr"; "Vladimir" appeared later on in Russian versions.

[24] In some of these byliny, e.g., *Oleksii Popovych and Tubarin Zmii,* the name "Vladimir" (Volodymyr) more likely refer to "Volodymyr Monomakh" who was identified with "Volodymyr the Beautiful Sun" only later.

[25] Vsevolod Miller, *Ocherki russkoi narodnoi slovesnosti,* v. 1 (Moscow: T-vo I.D. Sytina, 1897), 97-142.

[26] M. Khalanskii, *Velikorusskie byliny Kievskogo tsykla* (Warszawa, 1895), 212.

[27] V.I.a Propp, *Russkii geroicheskii epos,* izd. 2 (Moscow: Gosudarstvennoe izdatel'stvo khudozhestvennoi literatury, 1958), 68.

[28] What brings them close to a tale is a semicomic and slightly ironical coloring found in most of them.

The bylina about *Vol'ha* or *Volkh Vseslavych* and some byliny about *Sviatohor* were composed in the prehistorical period of the Kyjivan State. Some byliny originated in the Moscow period between the 14th and 17th centuries.

Byliny of the Kyjivan cycle and local byliny of Kyjivan Rus' spread to the North through Suzdal' and Novhorod, mainly to the provinces of Olonetsk, the White Sea coast, the Pinega, Mezen and Pechora rivers, to West Siberia and to the central Moscow lands. They were brought there by the colonialists from Novhorod and Moscow.[29] They also spread to the northern Caucasus and to some provinces on Volga and Terek rivers. In this process a certain role was played by professional folklore performers called "skomorokhy" (strolling actors) who escaped there in the 16th-17th centuries being persecuted by the government. The Kyjivan epos probably underwent some versional changes before it reached the North — some changes in the Novhorod provinces, the other in Moscow territories. There they also were subject to liguistic changes, that is, they took on a Russian appearance.

Toward the end of the 16th and the beginning of the 17th centuries new byliny ceased to be produced (with very few exceptions) everywhere, and they disappeared entirely in Ukraine, being replaced there by the Cossack epos "dumy". In Russia they continued to exist along with a new genre, "historical songs."[30] Towards the end of the 16th century they disappeared from the central Russia and Novhorod province and remained only in north Russia and west Siberia.

As for Ukraine, the main reason of their disappearance were new conditions of Ukraine's historical life. Being strongly desolate after the Tatar invasions, Ukraine was experiencing the whole series of new and much stronger historical shocks than before: wars with Turks, Tatars, Poles, enslaving etc. These shocks evoked the creation of the Cossack

[29] The Novhorod colonialization began in 12th-13th centuries, and the Moscow colonialization in 16th-17th centuries.

[30] "Historical song" adjoins bylina and sometimes it may even change to a bylina. Yet it differs from "bylina" in content and form. It is shorter, has less rigid epic "rituals" than bylina and is closer to reality. It presents historic events and depicts historic characters, e.g., "Ivan the Terrible", events of the "Troubled Times" etc.

epos, Cossack "dumy", which overshadowed and supplanted the old folk epos. In distinction from detailed, expanded bylina narrations, dumy are characterized by a lapidary style, dynamic scenes, dramatic tension, and vivid images. In distinction from the individual performance of byliny, dumy were performed in chorus, which was the cause of their lapidary style, reduction of the texts and exclusion of the details and epic retardation. The plots of dumy reflect historical events of the 17th-18th centuries and not the generalized events of the Kyjivan period.

And why did byliny remain in northern Russia? Why did they not disappear there? This happened because the territories there were situated far from numerous shocking historical events taking place in Ukraine and there was no stimulating cause for composing songs of the type of Cossack dumy. Here, as Gilferding put it "did not penetrate either soldier's billeting, or manufacturing and new fashion. Faithfulness to the old times and the faith in the miraculous — these elements constituting a necessary condition for the preservation of the epic poetry could hold their ground here."[31]

From the heroic byliny of the Kyijvan period toward the end of the 19th — beginning of the 20th centuries, in the Siberian byliny revealed was the image of Oleksii Popovych, with considerable loss of his distinct features in some provinces of the European north, particularly in the regions by Onega river. The plot of Oleksii's victory over Zmii Tuharin was recorded in some versions in the western parts of Siberia in its north-east parts. Detected was also bylina about *Mykhail Danylovych* in four versions in the region of the Indigirka river, in Russkoe Ust'e (Russian Outfall) and in Lower Kolyma.[32]

From non-heroic byliny of the Kirsha Danilov collection written down in Siberia were versions of *Dobrynia and Marynka, Ivan Hudynovych,* and *Potyk.*

In Siberia, there are many fragmentary byliny, e.g., a passage about

[31] *The Onega Byliny, Written Down by A.F. Gilferding in Summer of 1871,* izd. 4, v. 1 (Moscow-Leningrad, 1949), 34-35.

[32] A.M. Astakhova, *Bilyny...*, 272-73.

Il'ia Muromets. In Altai, there are texts of the type of the Cossack epos, dumy, e.g., a text about Oleksii Popovich, depicting hero's departure from home and his parting from his mother. There is also a song about the birth of the hero from the Serpent, which is a version of the bylina about *Volkh Vseslav'evych* (in the Kirsha Danilov collection) and bylina about the single combat of Il'ia Muromets with the hero Turk. The similarity between some versions of the Siberia byliny and the south Cossack dumy is explained in the light of historical events: dumy were brought to Siberia by the Cossacks mainly due to their forcible migration from Ukraine to Siberia during the reign of Peter the Great and Catherine the Second.

In the 20th century, especially in the Soviet period, records of the byliny, made by several expeditions in 1926-1939, displayed the process of dying away of the bylina tradition in oral usage. Many bylina plots did not live at that time already. New records of the 50-ies and 60-ies showed the increase of this process. Reasons for this are: forgetfulness resulting in the omission of various episodes and in distortion of logical sequences of the plots; loss of the feeling of the structural and stylistic features of byliny; the use of lexical neologisms; the transformation of the bylina plots to prose tales; the influence of other literary genres, and the lack of new generation's interest in "stariny", that is, in byliny dealing with what belonged to the very remote past.

In 30-ies there were attempts to create a Soviet bylina epos to express "heroic" events of the Soviet epoch and at the same time to propagate the linkage between the Russian-Soviet empire and the empire of Kyjivan Rus'. As an example, the narrator Peter Ivanovich Riabinin-Andreev, from the region of Onega river, composed a *Bylina about Chapaev* using traditional bylina devices, such as epitets, repetitions, fixed phrases etc., but his bylina was no success because there was too much contradiction between the old and the new content. Riabinin could not integrate the form and the content. There were attempts of some other imitators of the bylina genre but all of them were unsuccessful ventures; they presented a mixture of various genres, such as lyrics, narration, historical song, laments etc. not characteristic of the bylina genre.

In general, there were two causes of the frustrating attempts of the Soviet "folklore poets" to create bylina epos: a. The conflict between the form and the contents of their created works. It is unnatural to squeeze the content and the form of social realism of the Soviet structure into a heroic or non-heroic bylina patterned on the Kyijvan Rus' byliny with their characteristic structure, vocabularly and style, syntax, phraseology and even morphology. Such an artificial combination must create disharmony, decrease vital capacity of the work and preclude its dissemination among the masses of people becaue in such a work either the form distorts the content and the content must die, or the content makes the form dead. b. There was no struggle of the people of Kyijvan Rus' for human rights. Their main attention and goal were directed towards defense of freedom and liberty of their independent country by constant confrontations with the asiatic nomads (Polovtsi, Pechenegs, Tartars) whereas the people in the Soviet Union suffer deprivation of their basic human rights by the state and their attention to these rights and intention to struggle for them are cruelly suppressed by the state. In such deplorable conditions there exists only a possiblity of an individualistic creation determined by the communistic ideology and demands of the communistic party to propagate Marxism-Leninism and glorify its heroes. Yet such a creation does not correspond to the national psychology and ideals of the people at large, and the Ukrainian people in particular, and cannot become a folk epos.

Summary. Byliny of Kyjivan Rus' had been created on its territory and disappeared at the end of the 16th and the beginning of the 17th century being replaced by another genre 'dumy'. Even before their disappearance in Ukraine they disseminated to Russia where they were linguistically russianized, their contents took some versional shapes, and with these new features they served as patterns for the formation of new Russian byliny. The old versional and the new created byliny lived in oral usage in Russia till 20th century and have been totally ceasing their life in this form in the Soviet Union. Having ceased to live in oral usage in Ukraine centuries ago, byliny of Kyjivan Rus' continue to live in books along with better monuments of literary works. In this form they will live in Ukraine as its valuable heritage forever.

Two Representative Heroic Byliny of Rus'-Ukraine (Kyjivan Kievan Rus') (Introduction, translation and comments)

Every nation has its folklore, the main forms being folksongs, legends, myths, epic songs, tales, proverbs and sayings, riddles, folk art and folk customs. Ukrainian folklore has existed from ancient times, even before there was a Kyjivan state and the written language had not yet appeared. With the appearance of the written language, folklore did not disappear but continued to exist alongside written literary monuments, often exerting its influence on them.

One of the components of the folkloristic wealth of the Ukrainian people, inherited from the time of Kyjivan Rus', are *byliny*.[1] This genre occupies a significant place among epic songs.

The etymology of the word *bylina*[1] involves the base *byl'* (the root *by-* and suffix *-l'-*) meaning a) a fact; b) a story about unusual deeds of a

[1] The nominative singular in Ukrainian is *bylina*, and the nominative plural *byliny*. These forms are used throughout this article. Words in parenthesis are supplied by the translator to convey a better syntactical understanding in English.
The transliteration of Cyrillic in this article is that used by the Library of Congress.
The term *bylina* has been described in many ways by various investigators of the 19th century. There are two main views regarding the definition of *bylina*: A mythological view, according to which *bylina* is an older, prehistoric heroic epos based on mythological epos, stories about gods. Hence, specific features of this genre are not only stories about special heroes (bohatyrs) but also about the earliest times of the Kyjivan state in combination with images of some ancient titanic or mythological beings. Such a view was

hero. Such a song, or recitation was usually accompanied by playing on the psaltery.

The term *bylina* should be distinguished from the term *tale* or *fairy tale*. The latter are composed in prose, contain more popular elements, and do not have that "flight of animation" characteristic of epic song. The objective of a tale is to entertain and to moralize, while the objective of an epic song is to evoke respect and veneration.

The term *heroic bylina* or *heroic epos* is not identical with the term *duma*[2] or *Cossack epos* which arose in the 16th-17th centuries during the Cossack period, although their background is similar. Unlike the detailed and expanded *bylina* narrations, *dumy*[2] are characterized by a concise style, dynamic scenes, dramatic tension, and vivid images, and are performed in chorus, not individually, as in the case with *byliny*. The plots of *dumy* reflect historical events, mainly of the 17th-18th centuries, not the generalized events of the Kyjivan period.

The word *bylina* is commonly used even though a better term would be *bohatyr*[3] *epos*, or heroic epos. The term *bylina* was first introduced by Sakharov.[4] To justify his usage of this term, Sakharov referred to the manuscript of the merchant Bielski which contained, he said, a collection of *byliny*. Now general opinion is that such a manuscript never existed. Sakharov reprinted his *byliny* from the collection of Kirsha Danilov,[5] freely correcting them under the title of this manuscript

expressed, e.g., by A. Halakhov (*Istoriia russkoi slovesnosti drevnei i novoi*, v. 1, SPb., 1863, pp. 10, 18), I. Porfir'ev (*Istoriia russkoi slovesnosti*, part 1, drevnerusskii period, Kazan', 1870, pp. 36-84), F. Buslaev (*Istoricheskie ocherki russkoi narodnoi slovesnosti i iskustva*, v. 1, SPb., 1861, pp. 417, 420), and others. Another is a historic view of *bylina*. Its representatives, such as P. Kirievskii, did not see difference between *bylina* and the *historical song*. They simply call *bylina* a *historical song*. (Pesni, sobrannye P.V. Kirievskim, 1st ed., p.V.)

[2] The nominative singular in Ukrainian is *duma*, and the nominative plural *dumy*. These forms are used in this article.

[3] The word *bohatyr* meaning "hero", was borrowed from the Polovtsian *bohadur*, meaning "mighty, strong man". This word, *bohatyr*, as an epithet, became disseminated in the Ukrainian and Belorussian lands in the 15th-16th centuries, replacing the epithet *khrabr, khorobr*.

[4] I.P. Sakharov, *Pesni russkogo naroda*, part 5, SPb., 1839.

[5] *Drevnie rossiiskie stikhotvoreniia, sobrannye Kirsheiu Danilovym*, Moscow, 1818.

and taking the word *bylina* from *Slovo o polku Ihorevim,* (The Story of Ihor's Campaign) where this word is used in a different meaning. The proper term for the works called by Sakharov *byliny* is a traditional term *staryna.* Scholars have found this term in written monuments from the 15th century on.

The *heroic byliny* of Kyjivan Rus' were most likely composed in the 12th-13th centuries during the turbulent times of the Kyjivan state. They are similar in structure, their central theme being the hero's victory. It has no confidence in his strength, he is young, weak, and so on; in brief, he does not possess the required positive features. All this is intended to create the impression that the hero performer of the *bylina* wants to prepare for and bring about an unexpected effect, the victory over the opponent and a recognition and admiration for the hero. Differentiating features consist mainly in picturesque details accompanying this link, for example, place of action, names of secondary characters, and so on, however these details in terms of the final purpose of the heroic byliny have no significance.

The *heroic byliny* are also characterized by the integrity and completion of their various plots and their stylistic peculiarities. Among such peculiarities are various stereotyped phrases found in the beginnings of the *byliny* and in various descriptions. Other stylistic features are fixed epithets and epic retardations, that is, a hindrance and stretching out of the plot throgh the repetition of words and word combination, of lines, and even of the whole verses.

These common features are often accompanied by hyperbole, various comparisons, and contrasting images.

From the standpoint of the versification, most scholars agree that the rhythm of the *heroic byliny* in general, is based on the sequence of large syntactically unified word groups, and that the variations of the rhythms depend on changes in the distribution of stresses in different intensity.[6]

[6] A.Kh. Vostokov, *Opyt o russkom stikhoslozhenii,* SPb., 1817; V. Klassovskii, Versifikatsiia, Spb., 1863; F.E. Korsh, *O russkom narodnom stikhoslozhenii,* 1, *Byliny*, SPb., 1897; A.L. Maslov *"Byliny, ikh proiskhozhdenie, rymtmicheskii i melodicheskii sklad",* *Trudy muzykal'no-ethnograficheskoi komissii pri Etnograficheskom otdele Obshchestva*

By learning one or two *heroic byliny* of Kyjivan Rus' the reader obtains a relatively good insight into the structure and similarities of other *heroic byliny*[7]

Below are translations of two *heroic byliny*: a. *Il'ia Muromets*[8] *i Idolishche Pohanoe* (Il'ia Muromets and a Vile Big Idol); b. *Il'ia Muromets i Solovii Rozbiinyk* (Il'ia Muromets and Nightingale-Robber). The translator, Wasyl Jaszczun, has attempted to give an accurate contextual translation.[9]

a. A Vile Big Idol came to the capital city of Kyjiv
Creating there terror and great fear.
(He came) to prince Volodymyr
Stood on the princely court,
And sent his emissary to prince Volodymyr
Suggesting that Volodymyr, prince of Kyjiv,
Appoint for him a man of combat
As a challenger of his strength.
That emissary came to Volodymyr
And said these words:
"You, Volodymyr, prince of Kyjiv!
Appoint a man for single combat,
A challenger and opponent of great strength,
To combat in the open country against the Big Idol."
Prince Volodymyr became frightened,
Terrified, and began to grieve.
(To this) Il'ia said these words:
"Do not grieve, Volodymyr, don't be sad.

liubitelei estestovoznaniia, antropologii i etnografii, v. 2, Moscow, 1911; V. Zhirmunskii, *Vvedenie v metriku*, Leningrad, 1925; V. Briusov, *Opyty po metrike i ritmike, po evfonii i sozvuchiiam, po strofike i formam*, Moscow, 1918; M.P. Shtokmar, *Issledovaniia v oblasti russogo narodnogo stikhoslozheniia*, Moscow, 1952.

[7] The other heroic byliny are: *Istselenie Il'i Muromtsa* (The Healing of Il'ia Muromets), *Il'ia Muromets i Sviatohor, Il'ia Muromets i Sokol'nyk, Il'ia Muromets i Kalin-tsar, Ssora Il'i Muromtsa s kniazem Vladymyrom (Il'ia Muromets' Quarrel with Prince Vladymyr), Dobrynia i Tuharyn Zmievych, Sukhman, Mykhailo Danylovych, Vasylii Ihnatievych i Batyha.*

[8] The name "Muromets" could be a derivative of the town "Murom" or of "Muroms'k" or "Murovis'k", the town in the Chernihiv province.

[9] This translation was prepared from the text contained in P.D. Kraevskii, A.A Lipaev, *Russkaia literatura*, Uchpedgiz, Moscow, 1950.

I am not destined to die in combat;
I shall go to the open country
And shall kill that Vile Bid Idol."
Il'ia put on his silky shoes,
Put his cartridge pouck of black velvet,
Donned his Greek cap,
And went to the Vile Big Idol.
But he made a huge mistake:
He did not take with him the huge cudgel
Made of damask steel,
And did not take a sharp saber.
As he rides along he meditates:
"I am going to the Vile Bid Idol;
But (what will happen) if I am not lucky?
What shall I use to fight the Big Idol?"
At that time, at that moment,
He meets a stranger, big John,
Carrying a 90-pud heavy cane.[10]
Il'ia said to him these words:
"Hey, you, stranger, big John! Let me have your cane for a while;
I must go to the Vile Big Idol."
The stranger, big John, does not give him his cane.
Il'ia said to him these words: "Hey, you, stranger, big John!
Let's have a hand-to-hand combat.
I am not doomed to die in it.
I shall kill you and the cane will be mine."
Big John got angry,
Raised the cane above his head
And let it down into the raw ground.
The stranger went away and began to sob.
Il'ia Muromets barely pulled the cane out of the ground
And went to the white stony palace,
To that Big Idol.
(He) came to him and greeted him.
The Vile Big Idol said to him: "Does your Il'ia eat a lot of bread
And does he drink a lot of beer?"
Il'ia said these words:
He eats and drinks as much as I do."

[10] 1 pud 16.38 kg; 90 puds 360 lb.

Big Idol said these words:
"Then what kind of hero is your Il'ia?
I drink seven buckets of beer,
And eat seven puds of bread."
Il'ia told him these words:
"The father of our Il'ia Muromets was a peasant.
He had a voracious cow.
That cow used to eat a lot and drink a lot and it burst."
Big Idol did not like this.
He grabbed his steel dagger
And with all his strength
Swung it at the stranger.
Il'ia moved a little to the side
(And) the dagger missed him;
Il'ia rushed to the other side near the window.
Il'ia Muromet's passion flared up.
He took the Greek cap off his head
And threw it at the Big Idol
And killed him, cutting him in half.
And that's the fate of the Big Idol of vileness

The plot of this *bylina* is related to the folk legends about the people's fight with nomads. Vile Big Idol represents a giant trespasser, such as the Asiatic invadors Chigiz-khan, Batii, Mamai and others. It may also symbolize paganism, versus Il'ia Muromets Christianity. Il'ia's victory over Idol would then symbolize the victory of Christianity over paganism.

Here is a translation of another represetative bylina *Il'ia Muromets i Solovii-Rozbiinyk* (Il'ia Muromets and Nightingale-Robber):

I

b. A tall, handsome, and strong fellow
Was leaving the town of Murom,
And that village of Karacharovo.
At the morning Church service he was in Murom,
And he wanted to arrive in the capital city of Kyjiv for the midday service.
He was approaching the famous city of Chernihiv.
In the region of the city of Chernihiv
There were innumerable enemies.
They looked like a countless flock of crows;

Nobody walks there, nobody rides the horse,
The crow does not fly,
No grey beast scours about.
And there he was confronted by innumerable enemies.
And he started to trample them with his horse
And to stab them with his spear.
And having killed them,
He came to the famous city of Chernihiv.
There he was welcomed by its inhabitants.
They opened for him the gates of the city
And called him voivoda (the governor) of Chernihiv.
But Il'ia said these words:
"Listen, men of Chernihiv,
Show me a short road to Kyjiv."
The men of Chernihiv told him:
"O you handsome, good, brave fellow;
You wonderful hero (bohatyr) of saintly Rus'.
The short road is blocked with trees,
Covered with fallen trees, overgrown with grass.
Nobody has walked on foot
Or ridden on horseback down that road,
Because there, by the Black Slush,
And by that bend down birch,
And by that river called Smorodina[11]
The Nighingale-Robber sits in the oak;
Yes, the Nightingale-Robber, the son of Odikhmant.
That Nightingale whistles in a nightingale way,
And Robber shouts in a beastly way.
And from that Nightingale's whistling,
And from that beastly shouting
All the grass fades,
All the sky-blue flowers fall away,
Dark woods bend down to the ground,
And all the people there become lifeless.
That short road is 500 versts long,[12]
And the detour is exactly 1000 versts."

[11] smorodina current shrub.
[12] 500 versts about 350 miles.

II

Il'ia took his good hero's horse
And rode along that short cut.
His good horse, the hero's horse,
Began to jump from hill to hill,
From hillock to hillock,
Ignoring creeks and ponds.
Il'ia came up to the river Smorodina,
To that Black Slush,
And that bent birch....
The Nightingale whistled in a nightingale way,
The Robber shouted in a beastly way,
And all that grass faded,
The sky-blue flowers fell away,
Dark woods bent down to the ground.
Il'ia horse is good,
But it stumbles across the roots of the trees.
So the old Cossack,[13] Il'ia Muromets,
Takes the silky lash in his white hand
And hits the horse on his curved ribs,
Saying these words:
"Oh, you wolf-food and grassy sack!
You don't want to go or you can't carry me?
Why are you, dog, stumbling on the roots of the trees?
Haven't you heard the beast's shouting?
Haven't you seen the bohatyr's blows?"
And here the old Cossack, Il'ia Muromets,
Takes his drawn bursting bow,
Puts it in his white hands,
Draws a silky bow string,
Puts onto it a red-hot arrow,
Shoots the Nightingale-Robber
And knocks his right eye and temple out.
He knocked the Nightingale down to the ground,
Fastened him to the right damask steel stirrup,
And carried him through the nice open country
Passing by the Nightingale's cosy home...

[13] old Cossack an expierenced, professional Cossack. There were no Cossacks in Kyjivan Rus'; this word must have been introduced later on by the performers of this and other *byliny*.

III

He came to the famous capital city of Kyjiv,
To the court of the renowned prince.
Prince Volodymyr came our of the divine church,
Entered the white stony palace,
(And) went into his dining room.
There they sat down to drink and to eat bread,
To have bread and dinner.
And there the old Cossack, Il'ia Muromets,
Put his horse in the middle of the courtyard,
And he himself went to the white stony palace,
Came to the dining room,
Swung the doors wide open,
Crossed himself according to the custom,
Made a bow like a learned person,
Bowed low in three and four directions,
Made a special bow before prince Volodymyr
And before his subordinate princes.
Now prince Volodymyr began asking the brave man:
"You, fine, brave, handsome fellow,
Tell me where you're from.
You must have a name
And a fatherland, haven't you?"
The old Cossack, Il'ia Muromets (said:)
"I am from the famous town of Murom,
From the village of Karacharovo.
I am an old Cossack, Il'ia Muromets;
Yes, Il'ia Muromets, the son of Ivan."
Volodymyr said these words:
"How do you do, old Cossack, Il'ia Muromets!
When did you leave Murom
And which road were you riding to Kyjiv?
Il'ia said these words:
"Glorious Volodymyr, prince of Kyjiv!
I was in church at the morning service in Murom
And wanted to rush to the midday service in Kyjiv.
But the road was not free
And therefore I stayed too long.
I was riding along that straight road by the city of Chernihiv,
By that Black Slush,
And by that famous small river Smorodina,

And that famous bent birch."
Volodymyr then said these words:
"O you, big muzhyk-bumpkin!
You lie to me, myzhyk, to my face!
You're mocking me, muzhyk!
There are many (hostile) forces by Chernihiv,
And nobody goes on foot
Or rides on horseback down there.
Even a grey beast does not roam there
Nor the black crow does not fly over that road.
(That's because) by that Black Slush,
And by that famous bent birch
The Nightingale-Robber, Odykhmantii's son, holds his seat.
And as the Nightingale whistles in a nightingale way,
All the grass fades,
The sky-blue flowers fall away,
Dark woods bend to the ground,
And the people become lifeless."
Il'ia said to him these words:
"You Volodymyr, prince of Kyjiv,
The Nightingale-Robber is in the courtyard.
His right eye and temple are knocked out,
And he is fastened to the right damask steel stirrup."
Volodymyr, prince of Kyjiv,
Quickly stood up,
Put on his shoulder a marten fur coat,
On his ear a little sable cap,
And went to his broad court
To take a look at the Nightingale-Robber.
(Having met him) prince Volodymyr said to him:
"Nightingale, whistle in a nighingale way
And shout, you dog, in a beastly way."
Nightingale-Robber, Odykhmantii's son, said to him:
"Today I do not dine with you, prince,
And I do not want to obey you.
I dined with the old Cossack, Il'ia Muromets,
And I want to obey him."
Volodymyr, prince of Kyjiv, said:
"Well, you, old Cossack, Il'ia Muromets,
Command Nightingale to whistle in a nightingale way
And to shout in a beastly way."
Il'ia said these words:

"Nightingale-Robber, Odykhamtii's son,
Whistle half as loud as the nightingale does
And shout as loud as a beast does."
The Nightingale whistled in a nightingale way
And the Robber shouted in a beastly way,—
The cupolas on the beautiful houses became crooked,
The window frames shattered to pieces
From that Nightingale's whistling,
And the people became lifeless.
Volodymyr, prince of Kyjiv,
Covered himself with his fur coat.
And the old Cossack, Il'ia Muromets,
Quickly mounted his horse,
Carried the Nightingale to the open country,
And cut off his violent head.
(And) Il'ia said these words:
Enough whistling in a nightingale way,
Enough making fathers and mothers cry,
Enough making young wives widows,
And little children orphans."
Despite all this the Nightingale is glorified.
Yes, they glorify him for all time.

In the image of the Nightingdale-Robber are personified the cunning, perfidious and deceitful internal robbers living in the woods, and the external enemies of the people of Kyjivan Rus',the Polovtsian and Tartar hordes invading the land of the Kyjivan state. The *Bylina* as a whole presents a striking description of Il'ia Muromets' heroic fight with the enemies of his fatherland because they disturbed its peaceful cultural life. Despite the wrongful deeds of the invadors, their leaders symbolized by the Nightingale-Robber are glorified by them. This seems to imply the *bylina's* disapproval of a double standard of the moral and ethical principles in the political and social life of the people and the individual.

Il'ia Muromets was the most popular among the heroes of Kyjivan Rus'. His heroism seems to overshadow even the greatness of prince Volodymyr who plays a passive role in the *byliny* and stays in the background of the plots. Il'ia Muromet's popularity was witnessed by Erich Lassota, the Austrian emissary to Zaporozhtsi, who was in Kyjiv in

1594 and saw the hero's grave in St. Sophia Cathedral.[14] The Moscow priest Ivan Lukianov, who was in Kyjiv in 1701, said that he saw Il'ia as a "soldier": "We saw the brave soldier Il'ia Muromets, as tall as a big man of nowadays; his left arm is pierced with a spear, the whole wound is visible, and his right arm is in the position to make a cross."[15] Il'ia Muromets as a hero (bohatyr) was popular in Ukraine in the 18th and 19th centuries. Ivan Kotliarevs'kyi in his *Eneida* mentions how Il'ia Muromets "takes a walk, how he fights and chases the Polovtsi, how he defends Perisaslav." The Kyjivan ethnographer Trusevich in 1860 recorded the local old man's story about the Nightingdale-Robber who was brought by Il'ia to the princely court. Some other data indicate that Il'ia Muromets was a popular hero (bohatyr) in Kyjivan Rus'.[16]

The main objective of the above two *heroic byliny* is the same as the objective of the other heroic byliny of Kyjivan Rus', to glorify and extol the national heroes. The latter personify the power and ability of the nation to generate such heroes and at the same time to stir up the people's aversion and contempt for the enemies and to strenghten people's will to fight for victory, freedom and a peaceful life.

[14] A.M. Loboda, *Russkii bohatyrskii epos*, Kyjiv, 1896, p. 15.

[15] *Sbornik materialov dlia istoricheskoi tipografii Kieva*, p. 121.

[16] M. Hrushevs'kyi, *Istoriia ukrains'koi literatury*, New York, 1960, v. 4, pp. 68-69, 118-119. 120-121, 122-123.

SYNOPSIS

The Main Phonological Reflexes of Common Slavic in Ukrainian in Tabular Form

Following a brief statement on the Indo-European and Common Slavic (Proto-Slavic) period the author presents in tabular form the main reflexes of the Common Slavic phonological elements in Old and Modern Ukrainian. The reflexes include vowels, diphthongs, diphthongal combinations, consonants and their various combinations with vowels and three palatalizations. Examples for both periods of Ukrainian are cited in Cyrillic, followed by their phonemic transcription and English meaning. The tabular forms and accompanying notes show which phonological elements of the Old Ukrainian language disappeared and which have survived in Modern Ukrainian.

The Term and Name "Brody" in Western Ukraine

"Brody" is a town located in the northern part of Podillja in Western Ukraine. Its district consists of around 85 villages and about 18 settlements. In this paper the author gives the etymology of the name of this town, its first appearance in historical documents and its syntactic contextual usage in these documents. It is derived from the Common Slavic "brodъ", a noun common to all Slavic languages with its general meaning 'ford, fording place'. The name "Brody" appears for the first time in the Kyjivan Rus' document *Poučenie* (Precepts) written by Volodymyr Monomax by the end of the first quarter of the 12th century. The village itself was then a small settlement which developed into a significant town due to its very old and important trade route from Regensburg to Kyjiv. The paper also includes many derivatives from the

appallative 'brid' and the syntactical interpretation of the expression "na Brody". A map of the town and of some of the nearest villages of its district is included.

On Hard/Soft Labial Consonants in Modern Standard East Slavic Languages

The author examines phonemics of the labials in Modern Ukraine, Russian and Belorussian, trying to find out whether these consonants in these languages today are independent phonemes presenting contrastive pairs of non-palatalized: palatalized consonants or they present only a correlation of hard labials and their allophones. This paper shows that the labials (b p v f m) in modern standard Ukrainian appear only as non-palatalized phonemes (contrary to the statements of some scholars) and have no phonemically palatalized partners, in contrast with Russian where such a contrast exists and with Belorussian which in this linguistic aspect occupies a transitional place between Ukrainian and Russian.

Nouns in -u in the Genitive Singular in Modern East Slavic Languages

After a short statement on this topic from the historic point of view, the author examines the approximate corpus of masculine nouns with the genitive singular ending -u in Ukrainian, Russian, and Belorussian; the structure of these nouns and stress; their lexical-semantic similarities and differences; their phraseological equivalents; their current status and tendencies in literary usage. In modern Ukrainian there is a general tendency toward the expansion of the use of the Gsg ending -u with such nouns; in Russian the opposite tendency holds true; and in Belorussian the tendency is toward using the ending -u with some nouns of this category and the ending -a with others.

Deverbal Suffixless Masculine Nouns in Modern Ukrainian

On the basis of various dictionaries the author investigated the derivational process of deverbative masculine nouns with no suffixal morphemes, the genetic aspect of the formation of these nouns, their lexical-semantic relation to their derivational verbs, as well as morphophonemic changes accompanying this formation and irregularities in these changes. These are followed by the discussion of the productivity

of these nouns in contemporary Ukrainian which includes some structural and semantic limitations.

Suffixless Nouns in -a, Formed from Prefixed Verbs in Modern Ukrainian

This paper deals with the analysis of the morphemic composition of prefixed verbs and correlative nouns, both being extracted from the lexical stock in the dictionaries. A formula of the correlation between these two parts of speech is established, and the integration of the morphemes as well as morphophonemic changes in the process of this integration are discussed. The analysis also includes characterization of nonderivative stems of the prefixed verbs and derived nouns from the standpoint of the occurence of these stems in a free or bound form in the process of word-building. The analysis is completed with the investigation of the correlation betweeen stress and lexical-semantic features of the above nouns and verbs.

Vowel/Zero Alternation in the Nominal System of Contemporary Standard Ukrainian

This paper deals with an analysis of the above alternation in relation to its distribution in substantives, adjectives, pronouns and numerals with the implication of its relation to the consonantal environment; this is followed by description of its hierarchy, productivity and consistency with the indication of several deviations.

English Loan-Words in Modern Ukrainian

Among 24,000 foreign words in modern Ukrainian there are about 645 English loan-words which are listed in this paper. They entered the Ukrainian language mainly in the 19th and 20th centuries within the sphere of agriculture, economics and commerce, finance, technology, nautical terminology, botany, geology, zoology, sports, food and drink, travel and leisure, sociology, politics, etc. The author discusses the methods of the integration of these loan-words in Ukrainian, their phonological, morphological and stylistic integration, derivational process, stress and prognosis for their survival in the future.

Brief Comments on the Formation of Neologisms in Modern Ukraine

These comments summarize the misuse of morphemes in the Ukrainian press and scholarly journals. Through the use of improper structural elements not characteristic of the Ukrainian language, writers and editors create artifical, unnatural words which are doomed to early extinction. The process of such improper formations of neologisms is demonstrated on several different examples.

On the Equivalent of German Names and Terms with -ü in Ukrainian Phonology and Orthography

In the Ukrainian press, journals, books and other written materials one finds two different Ukrainian spellings of German names, terms, and word containing a syllable consisting of a consonant followed by *ü*. This paper deals with the following dilemma: does German [ü] in these instances corresponds to the Ukrainian [i] or ['u] (Cyrillic ю)? The author describes characteristic features of these elements in both languages from the phonetic point of view and draws a conclusion that the Ukrainian ['u] represents a better equivalent of the German [ü] both phonetically as ['u] and othographically as ю.

The Etymology and Semantics of "Kolyvo" — "Kutja"

Both terms are of Greek origin. They entered the language of Kyjivan Rus' after its Christianization, i.e., after 988, and were later adopted by the Moscovites as well. The ingredients of *kutja* have an allegorical meaning: Just as grain that has been sown gives birth to new stalks, so will an interred body one day arise from the dead. The honey in *kutja* symbolizes sweetness of eternal life.

The Effect of Ivan Franko's World-View on His Aesthetic Principles

The author refutes the various appraisals of Franko's Weltanschauung by Soviet scholars, who claim that the poet's world-view was materialistic, and that his literary works expressed this philosophy. In attempting to force Franko into a dialectal-materialistic framework, they label him an atheist and distort the true nature of his works. According to the author, Franko was a realistic idealist, inclined to embrace rationalistic and socialistic concepts suitable for raising his

people from their dismal economic and social-political conditions. By the end of 80's and the 90's he became even more idealistically oriented which is reflected in his works of that time period.

Religious and Moral-Ethical Tenets of Taras Ševčenko

In contrast with Soviet Marxist scholars who characterize Taras Ševčenko as a materialist and atheist, the author sees Ševčenko as a Christian who believed in a transcendental, supernatural Being. He analyzes Ševčenko's life as one based on Christian faith and Christian moral-ethical principles.

Ševčenko's Main Postulates for Reviving and Developing the Ukrainian Nation

These postulates are: the people's awareness of their national identity and dignity; the preservation of the Ukrainian language; learning and knowledge; resistance to foreign rule; constructive work for Ukraine; struggle for freedom and faith in ultimate victory; faith in God and the adherence to Christian moral and ethical principles.

Ševčenko in the Light of "Individualism" and "Personalism"

"Individualism" and "personalism" are widely treated in West European philosophical, psychological and sociological literatures. The author defines and describes the positive and negative features of these concepts and attempts to answer the question: was Ševčenko an individualist or personalist? He infers that Ševčenko was the type of man whose personality presented a combination of positive features of individualism and personalism. Thus, Ševčenko's love for his people and Ukraine was heroic, free from the negative traits of individualism. He was a personalist in the best meaning of this term.

Aus dem Nikolauskulte in der volkloristischen und religiösen Literatur in der Ukraine

The author attempts to postulate the genesis of the cult of St. Nicholas in Ukraine and to trace its growth and development on its territory. He carefully reviews the available historical data and points to a number of difficulties and contradictions confronting the scholar who studies the life and works of this saint. He analyzes the wealth of mate-

rial found in Ukrainian folklore and examines the role and function which the saint has played for the Ukrainian people. Contrary to the developments in the West, where the cult of St. Nicholas was spread by Church authorities, this same cult in Ukraine grew and developed first and foremost among the people and only later become sanctioned by the Church. By comparison the cult Of St. Nicholas was more widely spread in Ukraine than in Western Europe or even in Greece where it originated.

Der Einfluss des Abendlandes auf die Gestaltung des heiligen Nikolaus in der Ukraine

The author discusses the cultural and religious relations of Germany, Italy, and France to Ukraine, and traces possible occidental influences of the St. Nicholas cult on Ukrainian lands. He arrives at the conclusion that although the cultural influences of the West were noticeable in Ukraine in its medieval historical period, they were quite insignificant in the case of the cult of St. Nicholas.

Greek Legends of St. Nicholas in Ukraine

One of the most significant Greek legends is the "Legend about Saving the Life of Three Innocent Men Sentenced to Death". It is the oldest legend in Ukraine, known already by the end of the 10th century and possibly served as a source for the formation of other legends. Its main motif entered the texts of the Byzantine liturgies. The author discusses the legend within the context of historical events and traces its reflection in the lives of the people in Greece and Ukraine.

The Origin, Development, and Contemporary Destiny of the Byliny of Rus'-Ukraine (Kyjivan, Kievan Rus')

Some scholars assume that the byliny were created only by the Russian people, in the north, while others maintain that they were created in the south, in Kyjivan Rus', and only later they spread to the north, where they were linguistically russianfied. The author maintains that the byliny were created in Kyjivan Rus', most likely between the 10th and 13th centuries and in the following centuries spread to the northern provinces of Russia, specifically Archangelsk and Oloneck, along the Volga river, and in the south. They were replaced in Ukraine

toward the end of the 16th century by the Cossack epics known as "dumy". In Russia they survived only in northern provinces and in western Siberia. In the Soviet period the byliny became extinct.

Two Representative Heroic Byliny of Rus'-Ukraine (Kyjivan, Kievan Rus')

The author provides the etymology of the term *bylina* (pl. *byliny*), and comments on the differences that exist between the *bylina* and the *duma*. He postulates the time of the creation of the "heroic *byliny*", analyzes their structural features and focuses on the central themes within them, supplementing his discussion with the translation of two heroic byliny: "Il'ia Muromec i Idolisče Pohanoe" (Il'ja Muromec and the Vile Big Idol) and "Il'ja Muromec i Solovij Rozbijnyk" (Il'ja Muromec and the Nightingale Robber).

WASYL JASZCZUN'S OTHER SELECTED PUBLICATIONS

Books and monographs

"Судова розправа Гедеона Балабана (Факсиміле, переклад і опис мови юридичних документів 16-го століття") (The Lawsuit of Hedeon Balaban; facsimile, translation and linguistic description of the documents of the 16th c.), *Записки НТШ*, т. 171, Ню Йорк, 1961, ст. 59-133.

Phonetic, Morphological and Lexical Pecularities of the Snyriv Dialect, Slavistica, No. 49, Winnipeg: The Ukrainian Free Academy of Sciences (UVAN), 1964; 32 pp.

Russian Pattern Drills (for the classroom and the language laboratory) (with T. Kelly and J. Mastronie), Prentice-Hall, Inc. Englewood Cliffs, 1965; 124 pp.

A Dictionary of Russian Idioms and Colloquialisms (with Sz. Krynski), University of Pittsburgh Press, 1967; 114 pp.

Говір Брідщини (Dialect of the District of Brody in Western Ukraine), Ню Йорк: Наукове Товариство ім. Шевченка, Бібліотека Українознавства, т. 36, 1972, 51 ст.

П.М. Деркач, *Короткий словник синонімів української мови*, 2-ге поправлене видання, мовний помічник (A Short Dictionary of Synonyms of the Ukrainian Language, contributor Ню Йорк: Науково-Дослідне Товариство Української Термінології , 1975, 209 ст.

Дійсне і мрійне; поезії (The Real and the Dreams; poetry), Пітсбурґ-Ню Джерзі: наклад автора, 1981; 72 ст.

З нив і доріг життя; поезії (From the Fields and Paths of Life; poetry), Пітсбурґ: Українсько-Американське літературне видавництво, 1986; 212 ст.

До світла; поезії (To the Light; poetry), Пітсбург: Українсько-Американське літературне видавництво, 1988; 136 ст.

Selected book reviews

Long John Grison, *Русское чтение для среднего уровня,* Philadelphia: Childton Books, 1967, 88 pp. in *SEEJ* (Slavic and East European Journal), No. 2, 1968.

M. Antonovych-Rudnycka, *An Anthology of Russian Poetry*, Winnipeg: The University Press, 1968, 192 pp., in *Slavistica, No. 63. Slavica Canadiana, A.D. 1967*, Winnipeg, 1968.

Cooper, D.M., *Seven Russian Playlets*, Oxford: Pergamon, 42 pp., in *SEEJ*, No. 1, 1971.

Nadežda Harley, *Russian Tales: Adapted and Original Stories*, Cambridge: University Press, 1969, VIII, 84 pp., in *SEEJ*, No. 1, 1971.

Іван С. Тургенев, *Дворянское гнездо*, ed. with notes and commentary by Patrick Waddington, Oxford: Pergamon, X, 304 pp., in *SEEJ*, No. 1, 1971.

Г. І. Макарова, Л. М. Палатар, Н. К. Присяжнюк, *Вивчайте українську мову*, Київ; Вища школа, 1975; 254 ст., in *SEEJ*, No. 4, 1978.

Ю. О. Жлуктенко, Н. І. Тоцька, Т. К. Молодід, *Підручник української мови*, Київ: Вища школа, 1973; 351 ст., in *SEEJ*, No. 4, 1978.

Yar Slavutych, *Conversational Ukrainian*, 4th ed., Edmonton: Gateway, 1973; XXXI, 608 pp. in *SEEJ*, No. 4, 1978.

Walter Smyrniv, comp. and ed., *Ukrainian Press Manual: A Text for Intermediate Studies,* Oakville, Ontario: Mosaic Press, 1977, 185 pp. in *SEEJ*, No. 4, 1978.

Danylo Husar Struk, *Ukrainian for Undergraduates*. With an "Introduction to Phonetics" by Edward Burstynsky. Oakville, Ontario: Mosaic Press, 1978, XX, 350 pp. (Published for the Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies), in *SEEJ*, No. 3, 1980.

Ivan Zilyns'kyj, *A Phonetic Description of the Ukrainian Language*. Translated and revised according to the author's emendations by Wolodymyr T. Zyla and Wendell M. Aycock, Cambridge: Harvard Ukrainian Research Institute, 1979, IX, 212 pp.; in *Свобода*, 31 березня, 1983.

Проф. д-р Василь Лев, *Богдан Лепкий. Життя і творчість* , ЗНТШ, т. CXCIII, Ню Йорк-Париж-Сідней-Торонто, 1976; 399 ст. *Свобода*, 16-17 серпня, 1983.

Світильник істини. Джерела до історії Української Католицької Богословської Академії у Львові 1928-1944, т. 3, вид. Українського Католицького Університету ім. св. Климента Папи, Торонто-Чікаґо, 1983; 960 ст. в *Свобода*, червень 12, 13, 14, 1984.

Василь Сімович, *Українське мовознавство.* Упорядкування й вступна стаття Юрія Шевельова. The University of Ottawa Press, Canada, 1981; 451 ст. *Свобода.* "Мова про мову", березень, 1984.

Збаражчина: Збірник статтей, матеріялів і споминів, т. 2, редактор Володимир Жила, літ. редактор Яр Славутич, НТШ, Укрінський архів, т. XXXI Ню Йорк-Париж-Сідней-Торонто, 1985; 523 ст., *Визвольний шлях*, серпень-вересень 1987.

Українські діти — наше майбутнє. Збірник виховних матеріялів і антологія: Діти та молодь в українській літературі; ред. Ярослав Чумак, Торонто: "Добра книжка", 1979; 299 ст., *Свобода*, 8 березня 1988.

Микола Щербак, *Пахощі суцвіття* (1960-1970), Ню Йорк: Об'єднання українських письменників "Слово", 1982, 103 ст., *Свобода*, 24 червня, 1988.

Anna Vlasenko-Bojcun, *Onomastic Works*, Munich-Denver-Miami Beach: Ukrainian Free University, 1984. Forward by J. Rudnyc'kyj; 144 pp., *Свобода*, 1 лютого 1989.